

OLD TESTAMENT
QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL
OF JOHN

SUPPLEMENTS
TO
NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK. Bilthoven (Utr.) Netherlands

P. BRATSIOTIS

K. W. CLARK

H. CLAVIER

J. W. DOEVE

J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE

DOM J. DUPONT O.S.B.

A. GEYSER

W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN

PH. H. MENOUD

BO REICKE

K. H. RENGSTORF

P. SCHUBERT

E. STAUFFER

VOLUME XI



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1965

OLD TESTAMENT
QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL
OF JOHN

BY

EDWIN D. FREED



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1965

Copyright 1965 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To

Father and Mother whose
sacrifice made my edu-
cation possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Prolegomena	IX
1. Jesus and John the Baptist	I
2. The Cleansing of the Temple	8
3. Bread from Heaven	11
4. Taught by God	17
5. Rivers of Living Water	21
6. The Seed of David	39
7. You are Gods	60
8. Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem	66
9. The Unbelief of the Multitude	82
10. The Traitor	89
11. Hatred without Cause	94
12. The Son of Perdition	96
13. The Parting of Jesus' Garments	99
14. Jesus' Thirst	104
15. Breaking the Criminals' Legs and Piercing Jesus' Side . . .	108
Conclusions.	117

PROLEGOMENA

Shortly after becoming interested in the gospel of John as a graduate student, I began to feel that an investigation of the Old Testament quotations in the gospel, especially in light of the context of each, would yield interesting insights into the author's theological motives and method in the composition of his gospel. The completion of such an investigation has resulted in this book. In the process of investigation I have sought to determine: (1) the place in the gospel of each Old Testament quotation in light of the context of which it is a part and in light of the composition of the gospel as a whole; (2) from what Old Testament text—Hebrew or Greek—the author makes each citation; (3) what bearing a study of each quotation has on the problem of the relation of John to the Synoptics; and (4) what evidence there is for John's use of early Christian *testimonia*. So far as I know there is no book which deals with the Old Testament quotations in John in this way.

Works dealing with the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament in general ¹⁾ and those dealing with specific aspects of the problem of quotations ²⁾ are inadequate with respect to the problem in John. Recent works on the gospel of John have dealt only slightly with the matter of Old Testament quotations. In his comprehensive commentary ³⁾ Rudolf Bultmann deals with the quotations on the same basis as the rest of the material. In the equally valuable commentary in English C. K. Barrett ⁴⁾ devotes only several pages of the Introduction to John's use of the Old Testament and classifies the quotations on the basis of citation from either Hebrew or Greek text. In the commentary itself he deals with each passage in turn in an effort to determine the Old Testament source and text used. In an earlier article ⁵⁾ Barrett had dealt somewhat indirectly with the aspects of our problem other than that of the text but not from the same point of view and with only several

¹⁾ R. V. G. Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (1947) and C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* (1952), for example.

²⁾ A. H. Franke, *Das alte Testament bei Johannes* (1885), of which the third part, pp. 255-316, is the most useful; T. W. Manson, "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 34 (1952), pp. 312-332, esp. pp. 328-331; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (1952).

³⁾ *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (1950).

⁴⁾ *The Gospel according to St John* (1955).

⁵⁾ "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 48 (1947), pp. 155-169.

of the actual quotations in John. In his work on John¹⁾ Bent Noack discusses „Die alttestamentlichen Zitate.“ In several places our conclusions are similar; for example, Noack prefers Prov 18: 4 as the most likely Old Testament source of John 7: 37. But Noack goes on to suggest, perhaps rightly, that John might not know the Old Testament passage involved and that he was acquainted with the sentence from tradition, perhaps even as a „Herrnwort.“ The Old Testament sound of the words occasioned the use of the sentence as a citation with its introductory formula (pp. 81 f.). Noack, however, is not primarily concerned with the same aspects of our problem, and his conclusions on the relation of John to the Synoptics are entirely different. He says that in general it is doubtful whether John knew the Synoptics (p. 85). Noack also concludes that it is doubtful whether a testimony collection may be assumed as a source or Vorlage of one of our gospels, so especially in the case of John. On this point we agree.

Since the completion of the manuscript for this book, I have read with delight the work by Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (1961). It is reassuring to find that none of my conclusions is upset and that several are confirmed. Several of his conclusions are supplementary to mine, such as a stronger emphasis on the apologetic motives in the early Church. Lindars' main task has been to expose the doctrinal significance of the form of the text of the Old Testament quotations (p. 283).

With respect to John, Lindars seems to include all but four (1: 23; 7: 37 f.; 12: 13; 17: 12) quotations under the category of „*peshet* texts,” so called from the method of quoting scripture by the sect of Qumran and first applied to New Testament quotations by Krister Stendahl.²⁾ Five of those passages (2: 17; 6: 31; 6: 45; 7: 42; 10: 34) are all very closely related to the context and give the impression of reproducing the type of rabbinic disputation familiar to John at the school of Ephesus (p. 266). Lindars also calls attention to the influence of Zeph 3: 14 ff., in addition to Zech 9: 9, on John 12: 15 and suggests that we have there a *peshet* text based on a deliberate correlation of the prophecies of Zech and Zeph. The shorter text in John than in Matthew is not accidental because it is presupposed that when the King comes he will be „just and having salvation” (pp. 26, n. 2, 113). The quotations in 19: 24 and 19: 28-30 are used for symbolic reasons, the former to point out the

¹⁾ *Zur Johanneischen Tradition* (1954).

²⁾ *The School of St. Matthew* (1954).

irony that Jesus, the true high priest, was stripped of his priestly vestment when he gave himself in sacrifice; the latter the irony of his thirst by contrast with the statement in 4: 14. The last two quotations (19: 36 f.) have sacrificial significance. Jesus' legs were not broken to indicate that he was the true Passover victim. The piercing of Jesus' side allows John to include in the sacrificial symbolism the libation of the blood of the victim and make allusion to the sacraments of the Church (pp. 268 f.). For the *peshet* texts John most frequently draws on the stock of Passion apologetic—Pss 69: 10; 41: 10; 22: 19; 69: 22; 34: 21; Zech 12: 10; 9: 9; Is 6: 9 f. (p. 269).

Several of Lindars' general conclusions are worth noting. The fact that the words of Jesus himself are virtually canonized by twice (18: 9, 32) applying the fulfillment formula to them militates against any attempt to ascribe an early date to the gospel of John (p. 270). Here we are in complete agreement. We are in agreement also that the quotations in John cannot be isolated from the numerous scriptural allusions which enable him to develop a number of great themes for his theological presentation of Jesus (p. 271). Sifting the traditions of the school of Ephesus, John as a man of culture and intelligence, has produced a book which ranks as a first-rate source for early Christian apologetic (p. 272; cf. the last paragraph of my Conclusions).

Finally, Lindars also is inclined to reject the theory of a book or books of *testimonia* as postulated by J. R. Harris¹⁾ at the beginning of this century. He believes that such a testimony book was a development which followed rather than preceded the writing of the New Testament books (pp. 23 f.).²⁾

The procedure in compiling the results of this investigation is as follows. First, the individual or group in whose words the quotation is given is indicated, along with the particular formula used to introduce it. If the quotation occurs anywhere else in the New Testament, the references are listed. Passages in the New Testament where the same or similar formulas occur are also listed. Then, for each quotation, the views of the authors of some six or more standard works on the gospel of John are presented. Consequently there are frequent references to the views of

¹⁾ J. R. Harris and V. Burch, *Testimonies*. 2 vols. (1916-1920).

²⁾ In *Les Testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: l'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (1961) Pierre Prigent points to several factors which indicate the existence of *testimonia* behind early Christian literature (p. 28). I believe, however, that the factors may equally well be attributed to memory and/or theological motives on the part of the writers.

J. H. Bernard,¹⁾ C. H. Dodd,²⁾ E. C. Hoskyns,³⁾ Rudolf Bultmann,⁴⁾ and C. K. Barrett.⁵⁾ There are also several direct quotations from each of the works by these authors. I am grateful to the publishers for permission to quote from their publications by those authors. There is also frequent reference to the work by H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck.⁶⁾ My indebtedness to many other writers is constantly acknowledged in the footnotes. Passages quoted in John which are also quoted by the sect of Qumran are given to show in what way a quotation in John is quoted by that sect. Other relevant passages from the literature of that sect are also given from time to time. In several places we have found what seem to be important parallels between the usage of John and that of the sect of Qumran. Where a passage quoted in John is cited elsewhere in the New Testament, its usage in the place cited is discussed in its relationship to the passage in John. Finally, each quotation in John is discussed, sometimes word by word, and our own conclusions presented with respect to the source, text used, and its place in the particular context of which it is a part and in the composition of the gospel as a whole. In light of the evidence of various kinds which I have been able to present, I have drawn conclusions in several instances different from the usual ones, especially with respect to the origin or source for the quotation and the motive for its use.

I have used the name John (abbreviated Jn) for the writer of the gospel as we now have it simply for the sake of convenience, without implying or denying that a John was the original author. By the term "quotations" is meant those passages in the gospel which are apparently meant to be direct citations and are so indicated by the use of some introductory formula such as γεγραμμένον ἐστίν, etc. Therefore, passages such as 1: 51; 2: 4 f.; 8: 17; 10: 16; 12: 27, 34; and 16: 22, regarded by various authorities as quotations, are regarded as only allusions. On the other hand, passages such as 7: 38 and 17: 12, sometimes not treated as quotations, are by our definition included as quotations.

¹⁾ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St John*. 2 vols. *The International Critical Commentary*, ed. by A. H. McNeile (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929).

²⁾ *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge Un. Press, 1953).

³⁾ *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. by F. N. Davey. 2nd ed. rev. (Faber & Faber Limited, 1947).

⁴⁾ *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950).

⁵⁾ *The Gospel according to St John* (S. P. C. K., 1955).

⁶⁾ *Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 5 vols. (1922-1928). Cited simply as Str.-B. by volume and page numbers.

In dealing with a subject so complicated and difficult as this there will undoubtedly be omissions as the result of ignorance or oversight on my part. I only hope such omissions are neither too frequent nor too important. There are, however, two aspects of this study intentionally omitted in an effort to conserve space and keep the cost of publication at a minimum. Although I have made an effort to consider every textual variant, including readings from Origen's *Hexapla*, I have included only those variants which are actually referred to in the discussion of a particular quotation. I have also studied passages in the works of early Christian writers, from the Apostolic Fathers through Cyprian, wherever any of those writers cites the same passage cited in John. In most cases I have found that early Christian writers are of little real help in determining either the source of the quotation in John or the text used. Consequently, I have included references to early Christian writers only when they have seemed especially relevant to the discussion of a particular point in John.

I have constantly been grateful to my teachers Henry J. Cadbury and the late A. D. Nock for first interesting me in the subject of Old Testament quotations in John. Sincere gratitude is also expressed to Krister Stendahl who supervised the writing of a Ph. D. thesis on this same subject. Professor Stendahl's own work, *The School of St Matthew*, which deals with the problem of quotations in Matthew, is frequently referred to. I am especially grateful to my earlier teacher, Jacob M. Myers, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature and Theology, of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, for the use of many books from his library, especially for his materials on the Qumran Scrolls and his unpublished concordance to those writings. A word of gratitude to Herbert Schmidt and his staff of the library at the seminary in Gettysburg and to the Rev. Father Philips and his staff of the library of Mount Saint Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Maryland, for their ready assistance in every way.

Quotations from the Greek New Testament are from the 21st edition of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1952). Unless indicated otherwise, passages cited from the Hebrew Bible, LXX,¹⁾

¹⁾ It is impossible to tell, of course, what LXX text a N. T. writer used and whether a variant in a quotation is definitely due either to a genuine Septuagintal variant unknown to us or to a deliberate alteration of the text used by the writer. For our purposes it has seemed best to follow the edition of Swete (ms. B) and to compare with it variant readings from other mss. given in Swete and other critical editions. On the present state of LXX studies cf. recently S. Jellicoe, "Aristeas, Philo, and the Septuagint *Vorlage*," *JTS* 12 (Oct., 1961), pp. 261-271.

Qumran Scrolls, Targums, and early Christian writers are from the following texts:

Biblia Hebraica, 2 vols., ed. R. Kittel. 3rd ed. by P. Kahle, A. Alt, and O. Eissfeldt (1945).

The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, 3 vols., ed. H. B. Swete (1930-1934).

The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, ed. Millar Burrows with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee. Vol. I: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (1950). Vol. II, Fasc. 2: *Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (1951).

א. ל. סוקניק, ed. *אוצר המגילות העזרות* (1954).

Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, 6 vols., ed. B. Walton (1653-1657).

Patrologiae Cursus Completus, ed. J. P. Migne. *Patrum Graecorum* (1857-1866). *Patrum Latinorum* (1844-1866).

In addition to the above texts the Gottingen Septuagint and the edition of Brooke-McLean-Thackeray, the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Papyrus Bodmer II (P⁶⁶) and XV (P⁷⁵), and others have been checked regularly.

Finally, I want to say that the material in chapter eight of this book was originally published in essentially the same form in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. There it appeared as an article entitled "The Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John" in Vol. LXXX, Part IV (December, 1961), pp. 329-338. Since material in that Journal is thoroughly copyrighted, the material in that article is used here by permission of the editor. My sincere gratitude to the editor for that permission.

CHAPTER ONE

JESUS AND JOHN THE BAPTIST

Jn 1:23

Texts

Jn 1:23

Mk 1:2f.

καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ·

ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ·
εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου,
καθὼς εἶπεν Ἑσαΐας ὁ προφήτης.

· · · · ·
φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ·
ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου,
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ

Mt 3:3

Lk 3:4

οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ
Ἑσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·

ὥς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων
Ἑσαίου τοῦ προφήτου·

Text of quotation in Mt and Lk same as Mk

Is 40:3 (MT)

Is 40:3 (LXX B)

קול קורא במדבר	φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
פנו דרך יהוה	ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου,
ישרו בערבה מסלה לאלהינו	εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

I QS 8:14

ללכת למדבר לפנות שם את דרך הואהא כאשר כתוב במדבר פנו דרך
ישרו בערבה מסלה לאלוהינו היאה מדרש התורה [צוה ביד מושה

I QS 9:20

היאה עת פנות הדרך למדבר

Is 40:3 (Targ.)

קל דמכלי במדברא פנו אורחא קדם עמא דיהוה כבישו במישרא
כבשין קדם כנשתא דאלהנא

One of several things Jn has in common with the Synoptics in his presentation of John the Baptist is a quotation from Is 40:3. Cf. Mk

1: 3 = Mt 3: 3 = Lk 3: 4, where in every instance the quotation occurs in the words of the writer. In Jn it is put on the lips of the Baptist. The formula of introduction in Jn follows the quotation: "Thus said Isaiah the prophet." ¹⁾ Although each Synoptist uses a different formula, it always precedes the quotation. Jn's formula differs from that in any of the Synoptics but seems to be furthest from that of Lk. The same formula does not occur elsewhere in Jn or in the N. T. Cf. the different formulas of introduction for quotations from Is in 12: 38 and 12: 39.

The source of the quotation is Is 40: 3, but it is not immediately apparent whether the text used was Heb. or Gr. Burney ²⁾ says that Jn quotes from memory and substitutes the verb of the parallel clause for the verb פנו and that he seems to be thinking of the Heb. and not of the LXX, since the latter renders ישרו not by εἰσθύνατε, but by εἰθεῖλας ποιεῖτε. Barrett ³⁾ is not so quick to acknowledge Jn's dependence upon the Heb. He says that the quotation agrees with the LXX except in the use of εἰσθύνατε. Jn might have made his own translation of the Heb. פנו; but that cannot be inferred with certainty since he may have been influenced by the LXX in one or both of two ways: by the sound of εἰθεῖλας which in the LXX immediately follows the quotation or he may have recalled the use of εἰσθύνειν with ὁδός in Sir (2: 6; 37: 15; 49: 9). Bultmann regards Jn 1: 22-24 as an interpolation by a redactor from the Christian community. ⁴⁾

That the Heb. text of Is 40: 3 could be used to indicate fulfillment of prophecy is evident now from the practices of the Jewish sect at Qumran.⁵⁾ That sect, living in the desert, applied to itself as the true Israel (Cf. Targum of Is 40: 3 and 1 Cor 10: 18; Gal 6: 16; Rom 9: 6 for same idea in N. T.) and to its mission the words of Is 40: 3. Cf. IQS 8: 14: "To go to the wilderness to prepare there the way of the LORD; as it is written, 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD; make straight in the desert a highway for our God.' This is the study of the law, as he commanded through Moses." Cf. also 9: 20: "That is

¹⁾ In the N. T. formulas usually precede quotations, rarely follow; but cf. Rom 2: 24.

²⁾ C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922), p. 114; So also J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St John*. ICC, 1 (1929), p. 38.

³⁾ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John* (1955), pp. 144 f.

⁴⁾ Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (1950), pp. 57 f.

⁵⁾ Cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline Translation and Notes," *BASOR, Supplementary Studies* Nos. 10-12 (1951) and P. Wernberg Möller, "Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline," *Studia Theologica*, IX, Fasc. I (1955), pp. 40-66, esp. pp. 62 f.

the time of clearing the way to the wilderness . . .”¹⁾ It is interesting to note that in the context the mission of the community is primarily the study of the Torah (cf. 1QS 8: 15). In 1QS 9: 20, where Is 40: 3 is alluded to, its mission is primarily ethical and moral (cf. 1QS 9: 19-21). However, the ethical and moral are not completely absent from the first passage (cf. 1QS 8: 9-15), nor is the study of the Torah completely absent from the second.

Mk has the text of the LXX BA except that he substitutes αὐτοῦ for τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν of LXX and לאלהיו of MT. Mt and Lk agree exactly with Mk for the part quoted. Lk continues the quotation from Is 40: 4 f. with some omissions and is sometimes closer to LXX A and MT than to LXX B. The Synoptists clearly quote the LXX and alter the text from τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν to αὐτοῦ to suit their theological purpose, namely that the Baptist is the one preparing the way for the Lord Jesus. Here, as frequently in N. T. quotations, the κύριος of the LXX represents not the Yahweh of the O. T. but the Lord of the N. T.²⁾ Thus the quotation is interpreted and used by the evangelists themselves to indicate the fulfillment of an O. T. prophecy. The evangelist's purpose has given the quotation its Synoptic form, which in this case is the same for each. In addition to the textual variation the punctuation seems to indicate that the Synoptists followed the LXX.³⁾ By joining ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ to φωνῇ βοῶντος and dropping בערבה the Hebrew parallelism of “in the wilderness . . . in the desert” present in MT, Targum, and 1QS is destroyed. So also in Vulgate for all passages in question and Jn for the part quoted. Here again the form of the quotation is determined by the purpose or the motive of the evangelists. It may be said, however, that the MT for the verse as a whole as it now stands is not the best parallelism and that the construction in Jn is not wholly without parallelism of a sort.

Jn differs from MT, LXX, and Synoptics in the addition of ἐγώ. For this word there are no textual variants, and it may be a natural addition to the text of the quotation in accordance with the style and usage of Jn⁴⁾. If that be true, it is probably not to be taken as emphatic but simply as a stylistic tendency⁵⁾. Jn also differs from the Synoptists

¹⁾ Translations taken from Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Viking Press, 1955), pp. 382, 384.

²⁾ Cf., e.g., Mk 12: 36 f. and parallels; Acts 2: 34 ff.

³⁾ Burney regards the punctuation as unimportant since it is a secondary matter (*op. cit.*, p. 114).

⁴⁾ Cf., e.g., the ἐγώ εἰμι passages and 1: 27; 4: 14; 11: 27, *et al.*

⁵⁾ Cf. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* 1 (1908), pp. 85 f.; E. C. Colwell, *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel* (1931), pp. 51-55.

when he puts the quotation, as well as the formula, in the mouth of the Baptist; but like them he interprets it as a fulfillment of prophecy showing that the Baptist prepares the way of the Lord Jesus.¹⁾ Jn has the additional motive, however, of showing that the Baptist himself realizes the superiority of Jesus. This is characteristic of Jn and may be enough to account for the addition of ἐγώ. Cf. 1: 6-36; 3: 23-30; 4: 1; 5: 33-36; 10: 40-42.²⁾ But this gives ἐγώ an emphatic ring.

A more difficult variation in Jn is the use of εὐθύνω for ἐτοιμάζω of LXX and Synoptics. Aq. and Th. have ἀποσκεύασατε; Sym., εὐτρεπίσατε.³⁾ There are several possible explanations for Jn's reading. (1) Jn may have translated ישרו of the following line of MT with εὐθύνω.⁴⁾ The LXX translates ישר in Qal in various ways: with ὑθύνθη (εὐθύνθη A in vs. 20) in 1 Sam 18: 20, 26: "And the thing was pleasing in his eyes"; Jud 14: 3: εὐθεῖα (ἤρεσεν A); 14: 7: ὑθύνθη (ἤρεσεν A); 1 Kgs 9: 12: ἤρεσεν (ἤρεσαν A); Jer 27: 5: ἐὰν δόξῃ (BA); Num 23: 27: ἀρέσει (BA); 2 Sam 17: 4: εὐθής (BA); 1 Chr 13: 4 εὐθής (BA); 2 Chr 30: 4: ἤρεσεν (BA); Jer 18: 4: ἤρεσεν (BA); Qal with דרך in sense of "go straight ahead" by κατεύθυναν (κατηύθυναν A) in 1 Sam 6: 12. LXX translates ישר in Pi. in the following ways: with דרך, Prov 11: 5: ὁρθοτομεῖ ὁδούς (BA); Is 45: 2: וְהָדַרְתִּי, אוֹשֶׁר, καὶ ὁρη ὁμαλιῶ (BA); Is 45: 13: καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ εὐθεῖαι. Cf. also Prov 3: 6: "In all thy ways (דרך, ὁδός) acknowledge him, and he will direct (ישר, ὁρθοτομέω) thy paths" (ארח, ὁδός); 9: 15: "To call to them that pass by (עבר־דרך, πάρειμι (+ ὁδόν A), who go right on their ways" (ישר ארח, κατευθύνοντας ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν; 15: 21: "A man of understanding maketh straight his going" (κατευθύνων πορεύεται).⁵⁾ In Hi. Is 45: 2 (cf. above); Prov 4: 25 f.: "Let thine eyelids look straight before thee (ישרו נדך, νεύετω δί'αγια), . . . And let all thy ways be established" (וכל־דרכיך יכנו, καὶ τὰς ὁδούς σου κατεύθυνε

¹⁾ Is 40: 3 was also interpreted messianically in late Rabbinic literature; cf. Str.-B., I, pp. 96 f.

²⁾ T. F. Glasson, "John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel," *ET* 67 (1956), pp. 245 f.; Carl H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (1951), *passim*, esp. p. 180.

³⁾ Fridericus Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. (1875). According to Joseph Ziegler ms. 86 has a reading of εὐθύνετε for Aq. but differs from Jn for what follows („Isaias" in *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis*, vol. xiv (1939). Cf. Krister Stendahl, *The School of St Matthew* (1954), p. 47.

⁴⁾ So, e.g., Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 114. The readings which follow are from LXX B except where otherwise indicated.

⁵⁾ I have not found the equivalent of פנו אורחא of the Targum in the MT, but ישר ארח does occur in MT, and ארח is sometimes synonymous with דרך, e.g., Prov 3: 6; 9: 15; cf. also Is 57: 14 and 62: 10.

BA); Ps 5: 9: "Make thy way straight (הוֹשֵׁר דֶּרֶךְ, κατευθύνων . . . τὴν ὁδόν μου BA) before my face."

Cf. further the Heb. and Gr. texts of Prov 20: 24: "A man's goings are of Jehovah; How then can man understand his way?" Cf. also Sir 2: 2; 6: 17; 38: 10; and especially the following:

2: 6: εὐθύνων τὰς ὁδούς σου καὶ ἔλπισον ἐπ' αὐτόν.

37: 15: ἵνα εὐθύνῃ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὁδόν σου

39: 24: αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὁσίοις εὐθεῖαι

49: 9: καὶ ἀγαθῶσαι τοὺς εὐθύνοντας ὁδούς

Cf. also 3 Macc 2: 17 and LXX of Num 22: 23 and Josh 24: 23 where εὐθύνω translates נָסַח in Qal and Hi.

These examples reveal several interesting facts. If we take κατευθύνω as frequently a synonym of εὐθύνω in the LXX,¹⁾ εὐθύνω or a word derived from the same stem is used to translate יָשַׁר in a majority of passages where the ethical and moral element prevails. If one includes its use in Sirach, the fact is the more striking. There is no difference here between LXX B and A. In both thought and language Jn shows a kinship to the wisdom literature of the Hebrew and Greek O. T. Prov 4: 25f. and 20: 24 are especially enlightening. In 4: 25 f. the presence of יָשַׁר in vs. 25 and דֶּרֶךְ in vs. 26 next to the end probably led to the translation of the final כֹּן in Ni. with κατευθύνω. Or perhaps since כֹּן followed immediately after דֶּרֶךְ, this alone would account for the use of κατευθύνω. The whole passage has a more marked ethical and moral character in the LXX than in the MT. For another example of the same kind cf. Ps 118: 5. In Prov 20: 24 the presence of דֶּרֶךְ or ὁδός (here we can't tell which) in the second part of the vs. probably led to the addition of εὐθύνω to the text of the first part of the vs. in the LXX. In the same way Jn may naturally have used εὐθύνω in view of the following דֶּרֶךְ of MT or ὁδός of the LXX in Is 40: 3. It is difficult, therefore, to tell if Jn used the Heb or Gr text.

(2) Perhaps Jn translated פָּנָה with εὐθύνω.²⁾ פָּנָה is used with דֶּרֶךְ in MT only four times, and in each case is in the Pi and occurs nowhere else in Pi. The passages (in addition to Is 40: 3) are as follows: Mal 3: 1: ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδόν (Mk 1: 2: κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν = Mt 11: 10 = Lk 7: 27; Aq., σχολάσει; Sym., ἀποσκευάσει; Th., ἐτοιμάσει); Is 57: 14: καθαρῖσατε . . . ὁδούς . . . ἄρατε (Aq., ἀποσκολοπίσατε, ἀποσκευάσατε;

¹⁾ So in the N. T. in Lk 1: 79 and 1 Thess 3: 11 its use is synonymous with εὐθύνω of Jn 1: 23. Cf. also 2 Thess 3: 5 and contrast James 3: 4.

²⁾ So, e. g., Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 f.

Sym., ὁδοποιήσατε, σχολάσατε; Th., ἐξάρατε, σκευάσατε);¹⁾ Is 62: 10: ὁδοποιήσατε . . . ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ (Sym., Th., ἀποσκευάσατε ✕ τὴν ὁδόν (86); Th., σκευάσατε τὴν ὁδόν (93). Among the many words used in the LXX to translate פנה, ἐπιβλέπω is used most frequently; κατασκευάζω not once. Most important for us is the fact that neither εὐθύνω nor any of the words from the same stem, εὐθύς, εὐθύς, εὐθύτης, is ever used to translate פנה. But all are used at times to translate ישר in its various forms, and εὐθύνω translates only ישר and פנה of MT. It is difficult, if not impossible, to tell whether Jn is dependent upon MT or LXX, although there may be a slight edge in favor of the Heb.

(3) Perhaps Jn follows the same textual tradition as Aquila (according to one ms.), but this is unlikely in view of the differences which appear in the text of Aq. for the rest of the quotation.

(4) Perhaps Jn used εὐθύνω for εὐθείας ποιεῖτε which follows immediately in LXX.²⁾

(5) Jn may have quoted from memory and substituted ישר of the parallel clause for פנה.³⁾

(6) Perhaps the best solution to the problem is to say that Jn, a Jew thoroughly trained in the Hebrew and Greek scriptures, drew from his memory of various texts, or combination of texts and sources, a quotation to suit his purpose. On the other hand, he may deliberately have chosen εὐθύνετε, "make straight"—in the sense of moral and ethical direction, not of the surface of a road—as the word which best expressed his thought. Jn meant to say that the Baptist was the precursor of Jesus. This thought he shared with, or perhaps borrowed from, the Synoptists. For Jn, however, Jesus would not only take the same course; he would surpass the Baptist—as his gospel clearly shows. For Jn, the Baptist set the ethical and moral "way" Jesus was to go. The word ἐτοιμάσατε was too ineffective to express Jn's thought. That the ethical and moral sense is meant seems clear from the evidence, especially the passages from the wisdom literature.⁴⁾ Note also that according to the contexts of the passages from the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline even the MT was interpreted as having an ethical and moral significance.⁵⁾

¹⁾ In Is 57: 14 ethical emphasis is greater in the Targum than in MT or LXX. In Is 57: 14 and 62: 10 the MT פנוֹ-דֶרֶךְ (האם) is in Targum אפנו לב עמא לאורח which shows the same ethical interpretation as Jn 1: 23.

²⁾ This is the view of Origen in his *Comm. on John* 6: 24 ff. So also Barrett.

³⁾ So Burney and Bernard.

⁴⁾ The ethical and moral sense is clearly meant when Paul accuses Elymas the magician of "perverting the straight paths of the Lord," probably an allusion to Hos 14: 10 (Acts 13: 10).

⁵⁾ In a recent article S. Vernon McCasland concludes that the Way as a designa-

The context of the gospel of John lends additional support to our argument. There is in it nothing of the apocalyptic or eschatological element of the context of Is from which the quotation comes. In Is the apocalyptic element is the only one. In Mt and Lk the apocalyptic element is predominantly retained (cf. Mt 3: 2, 7-12; Lk 3: 7-18), though the ethical one is not absent, especially in Lk (cf. Mt 3: 8; Lk 3: 8, 10-14). In Mk the only element seems to be the preaching of "repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (1: 4). The context in Mk is neutral in this respect. In Jn the various contexts of the Baptist passages may best be interpreted as ethical and moral. Note the absence of the baptism with fire (with Mk), the witness to the light (best interpreted in view of 3: 19-21; 12: 35 f.), and the author's understanding of the Baptist in our quotation. Actually, Jn may not be using an O. T. text at all but simply interpreting the Synoptics in line with his view of the Baptist, making the several changes accordingly. This would account also for the quotation on the lips of the Baptist himself and the insertion of the formula as an after-thought at the end. See the chapters dealing with Jn 7: 42; 12: 13, 15; 19: 24; 19: 28 f.; and 19: 36 f. below.

tion for Christianity was derived from Is 40: 3; that the idiom was used in a similar sense by the sect of Qumran as a designation of its life; that the Christians probably derived it from Qumran; and that the agent of the transmission was John the Baptist ("TheWay," *JBL* 77 (1958), pp. 222-230).

CHAPTER TWO

THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE

Jn 2:17

Texts

Jn 2:17

ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν· ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με.

Ps 69:10 (MT)

כִּי־קָנָא בֵּיתְךָ אֶכְלָתִי

Ps 69:10 (LXX B)

ὅτι ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με

Ps 119:139 (MT)

צַמְתַּתִּי קִנְאָתְךָ

Ps 119:139 (LXX B)

ἐξέτηξέν με ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου

After narrating the cleansing of the temple, Jn introduces the quotation in 2:17 with a unique formula: "His disciples remembered that it was written." Cf. 12:16 where, after the quotation from Zech 9:9, Jn comments: "These things his disciples did not understand at first, but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written of him and that they had done these things to him." In 2:22, after Jesus' statement about destroying "this temple" and raising it up again, and after the comment, "But he spoke of the temple of his body," Jn adds: "When, therefore, he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he said this . . ." Jn uses ἐστίν γεγραμμένον also in a formula in 6:31 (with καθώς), 45 (with ἐν τοῖς προφήταις); 10:34 (with ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν); 12:14 (with καθώς); cf. also 12:16.¹

The quotation occurs nowhere else in the N. T., but the second half of Ps 69:10 is cited in Rom 15:3. Although both Paul and Jn apply their

¹) γεγραμμένον ἐστίν like γέγραπται corresponds to the Rabbinic formula כְּתִיב (ד) (Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 87, n. 4).

respective quotations to Jesus, there is hardly sufficient evidence for supposing that this verse of the psalm was generally accepted and used messianically when these citations were made.¹⁾

It is difficult to determine the relation of the quotation to its context. Bultmann²⁾ says that the presentation is interrupted in vs. 17 by a remark of the evangelist, as in vs. 22 and 12: 16, and that οὖν of vs. 18 joins it directly to vs. 16. He also says that the sense is hardly that Jesus' action is an expression of the zeal consuming him. Much rather, the evangelist has the following (i.e., „das Ganze des Wirkens Jesu'') in view and means that Jesus' zeal will lead him to his death. This may be partly true in view of vss. 18-25.³⁾ But it is difficult to follow Bultmann entirely, especially when he adds that this corresponds to the traditional use of Ps 69 in primitive Christian proof from prophecy and refers to Rom 15: 3 where the second half of Ps 69: 10 is cited. The fact that parts of Ps 69 are quoted in Rom 15: 3; Acts 1: 20; Rom 11: 9 f.; and Mt 27: 34, 48 hardly has a bearing on our problem since the quotation in Jn occurs nowhere else.

It is better to take our quotation in vs. 17 as belonging with the cleansing of the temple which precedes it rather than with the discourse of the Jews with Jesus which follows it. Jn's motive for including the quotation seems to be that of showing the fulfillment of an O. T. prophecy in an action or deed of Jesus.⁴⁾ Jesus' action in cleansing the temple is interpreted as a result of his zeal for the temple, his Father's house. This probably comes close to the original meaning of the vs. in the psalm.⁵⁾ Jesus' action recalls to the disciples' minds the words of the psalm, so they "remembered that it was written." This formula is only a literary device on the part of Jn to convey the point of the quotation which he took messianically.

Whatever the true relation of this quotation to its context, as it now stands it agrees literally with the LXX B_x as against the MT. The readings of the LXX B_x here probably do show influence from Jn 2: 17

¹⁾ Against E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (1957), p. 97, n. 4. Cf. also Barnabas Lindars who says that Ps 69 was an original part of "the Passion apologetic" (*New Testament Apologetic* (1961), pp. 103-107.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 87 and n. 3.

³⁾ So also Hoskyns, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

⁴⁾ Cf. also 2: 22 and 12: 16.

⁵⁾ Cf., e.g., W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms* (1955), p. 330: "What had occasioned the immediate animosity of many who were otherwise in close touch with him seems to have been that the psalmist had forcibly prevented some unseemly proceedings in the temple . . ."

as Rahlfs¹⁾ and Torrey²⁾ suggest. If Jn read a past tense from either the Heb. or Gr. text, then the change from the past to the future tense was made necessary by the immediate context for the understanding of the quotation as a prophecy which became fulfilled in Jesus' action. While the future may be a rendering of the Hebrew perfect,³⁾ it would hardly be so rendered here. In the first place, the Heb. verbs in both halves of the vs. are perfects, and the LXX renders the verb in the second half with an aorist. Moreover, the LXX usually uses the aorist tense to translate a Heb. perfect.⁴⁾ In Rom 15: 3 Paul quotes the second half of the vs. literally, including the verb ἐπέπεσαν for which there are no textual variants in either the LXX or Rom. Sym., while using a different verb (κατηγαλωσε), has an aorist form, nevertheless. Rahlfs' text also has the aorist form κατέφαγεν, apparently from A. We note also that Origen's column in the *Hexapla* has the same form as Rahlfs and that in the same passage in Ps 119: 139 both MT and LXX have a past tense of the verb.

On the basis of the evidence, it appears that Jn read a past tense in his O. T. text and changed it to the future tense because his context required the future to make the O. T. passage appear as a prediction which had its fulfillment in a deed of Jesus. The future tense of the present LXX B^x texts is probably due to Christian influence from Jn.

¹⁾ In both his own edition of *Septuaginta*, 2 (1949), p. 71 and in the *Septuaginta . . . Gottingensis*, X: *Psalmi cum Odis* (1931).

²⁾ *The Four Gospels*, p. 281.

³⁾ Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁴⁾ Cf. R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, 1, p. 43; for examples cf. by the same author, *A Handbook to the Septuagint* (1920), pp. 120-125.

CHAPTER THREE

BREAD FROM HEAVEN

Jn 6:31

Tetxs

Jn 6:31

καθώς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον· ἄρτον
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

Ex 16:4 (MT)

הָנִי מַמְטִיר לָכֶם לֶחֶם
מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם

Ex 16:4 (LXX B)

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὣω ὑμῖν ἄρτους
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

Ex 16:4 (Targ. Onk.)

הָא אָנָּא מַחִית לֶכֶן לַחְמָא
מִן־שָׁמַיָא

Ex 16:15 (LXX B)

οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἔδωκεν κύριος
ὑμῖν φαγεῖν.

Ex 16:15 (MT)

הוּא הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה
לָכֶם לֶאֱכֹלָה

Ex 16:15 (Targ. Onk.)

הוּא לַחְמָא דִּיהָב יִי לֶכֶן לְמִיכַל

Ex 16:15 (Targ. Jon.)

הוּא לַחְמָא דַּאֲצִטְנַע לֶכֶן מִן
שִׁירְיָא בְּשִׁמִּי מְרוּמָא וְכֹדֹן
יְהִיבִיה יִי לֶכֶן לְמִיכַל

Ps 78:24 (LXX B)

καὶ ἔβρεξεν αὐτοῖς μάννα φαγεῖν,
καὶ ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς·

Ps 78:24 (MT)

וַיִּמְטֵר עֲלֵיהֶם מִן לֶאֱכֹל
וַדְגַּן־שָׁמַיִם נָתַן לָמוֹ

Ps 78:24 (Targ.)

וְאִחִית עֲלֵיהֶן מִנָּא לְמִיכַל
וְעִבּוֹר שְׁמִיָּא יְהִיב לַהֶן

A key passage in Jn's presentation of Jesus as "the bread of life" is a quotation dealing with the manna in the wilderness. Like those in 7:42; 12:13; and 12:34, this citation occurs on the lips of the multitude who follow Jesus and is found nowhere else in the N. T. The formula καθώς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον occurs also in Jn 12:14 but nowhere else in the N. T. Cf. εὗρεν [τόν] τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον (Lk 4:17). A common

formula in the N. T. is καθὼς γέγραπται,¹⁾ but it occurs nowhere in Jn.

There is no one passage from the O. T. which completely satisfies this quotation, but the most direct sources are Ps 78: 24 and Ex 16: 4. In addition cf. Ex 16: 15, 35; Dt 8: 3, 16; Num 11: 6-9; Josh 5: 12; Neh 9: 15, 20; Ps 105: 40; Prov 9: 5; Wis 16: 20; 2 Bar 29: 8. The context seems to indicate that the writer may have had several O. T. passages in mind. The combination of manna and bread occurs in the O. T. in Dt 8: 3 as well as in Ps 78: 24, and the same combination occurs in Jn 6: 31 and 6: 48-50. Several Johannine terms, πνεῦμα, δίδωμι, μάννα, ὕδωρ, δίδω (Jn uses the verb διψάω in 6: 35) occur in Neh 9: 20. Those O. T. passages may have influenced the thinking of Jn in developing the context of the quotation, especially his idea of Jesus as "the bread of life" and "the living bread" in 6: 35, 48, 51. Cf. also his idea of Jesus as the giver of "living water" in 4: 10 f.; 7: 38.

Philo is also interested in bread and manna. He says that "the sacred word bears abundant witness that the food of the soul is not earthly but heavenly" and then quotes Ex 16: 4 as evidence. "The soul is nourished not with earthly and perishable things but with such words as God shall have rained from the lofty and pure sphere which he [i.e., the writer or Moses or God] has called heaven."²⁾ Here the nourishment of the soul seems to be knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) because he says: "The people, and all that goes to make the soul, is to go out and gather and make a beginning of knowledge, not all at once but 'the day's portion for a day.'"³⁾ In *Leg. Alleg.* 3: 59 (= 169 f.) Philo quotes Ex 16: 15 f. and interprets τὸ ῥῆμα (Heb דבר) of vs. 16 as the word of God. "You see of what sort the soul's food is. It is a word of God, continuous, resembling dew, embracing all the soul . . ." In 3: 60 (= 172 f.) he says: "This bread is the food which God hath given to the soul, for it to feed on His own utterance and His own word; for this bread, which He hath given us to eat, is 'this word.' " In 3: 61 (= 175) he quotes Dt 8: 3 and says: "We have a proof . . . in His feeding us with His own most 'generic' (or 'all-embracing') word [λόγος] for 'manna' means 'something,' and this is the most generic of all terms. And the word [λόγος] of God is above all the world, and is eldest and most all-embracing of created

¹⁾ Cf., e.g., Mk 1: 2; Mt 26: 24; Lk 2: 23; Acts 7: 42; and frequently in Paul, e.g., Rom 1: 17; 2: 24; 1 Cor 1: 31; 2 Cor 9: 9.

²⁾ *Leg. Alleg.* 3: 56 (= 162 f.).

³⁾ Translation here and in places which follow from F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker in the Loeb series, *Philo with an English Translation*, 10 vols. (Harvard Un. Press, 1929-1962).

things. This word [λόγος] 'the fathers knew not.' " In 2: 21 (= 86) Philo quotes Dt 8: 15 f. and says: "The manna is called 'somewhat,'¹⁾ and that suggests the *summum genus*. But the primal existence is god, and next to Him is the Word [λόγος] of God . . ." In *De Fuga* 25 (= 137 f.) Philo quotes Ex 16: 4 and 16: 15 and refers to the bread or manna as wisdom [σοφία]. After the quotation from Ex 16: 4 he says: "For in very deed God drops from above the ethereal wisdom upon minds . . . and are filled with pleasure, being fully aware of what they feel, but wholly ignorant of the cause which produced the feeling. So they inquire 'What is this' . . . ? And they will be taught by the seer that 'This is the bread, which the Lord hath given them to eat.' " In *Quis Rer. Div.* 15 (= 75 ff.) "the manna" is "the word of God, the heavenly incorruptible food of the soul . . ." (τὸ μάννα . . . τὸν θεῖον λόγον, τὴν οὐράνιον ψυχῆς . . . ἀφθαρτον τροφήν). In 39 (= 189 ff.) this "food" is wisdom—"the heavenly food [τροφή] of the soul, wisdom, which Moses calls manna." In *De Cong.* 30 (= 168 ff.) Philo speaks of the manna as "the food that costs no toil or suffering, the food which without the cares and pains of men came not from the earth in the common way, but was sent, a wonder and a marvel from heaven for the benefit of those who should use it . . . wisdom, the one true food of us all . . ."

The giving of manna and bread played a part in the thinking of Philo, as it had already in the thinking of O. T. writers. The same thing is true for several writers of the Apoc. and Pseud. In Wis 16: 20 the manna is referred to as "angels' food" (ἀγγέλων τροφήν²⁾ and "bread prepared . . . from heaven . . . without toil . . ."³⁾ The writer of 2 Bar, who may be close to the time of Jn, expected a repetition of the manna from heaven at the consummation of time. "And it shall come to pass at that self-same time that the treasury of manna shall again descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time" (29: 8).⁴⁾

According to Rabbinic belief the messiah as a second deliverer must correspond to the first deliverer Moses; consequently, the miracle of the manna must be repeated.⁵⁾ This belief may be reflected by the

¹⁾ Gr. is τί, apparently from Ex 16: 15: τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο. Cf. also *Quod. Det.* 31 (= 115).

²⁾ Cf. ἄρτον ἀγγέλων in Ps 78: 25.

³⁾ Cf. Philo, *De Cong.* 30 (= 168 ff.).

⁴⁾ Trans. from R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 (1913), p. 498. Cf. also Sib. Frag. 3: 46-49; 1 Cor 10: 1-4; Rev 2: 17.

⁵⁾ Cf. Str.-B., 2, pp. 481 f.; 4, pp. 890, 954; H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel* (1929), pp. 240 ff.

Synoptists in the story of the temptation of Jesus to turn stones into bread (Mt 4: 3 f. = Lk 4: 3 f.).

There are points of contact in Jn with the ideas expressed in the examples from the literature cited, and they are important for our understanding of Jn's treatment of the manna and bread. The ideas of manna, as well as those of water, in Jewish literature have their parallels in the water and bread of Jn 4 and 6. However, Jn's idea that Jesus himself is the bread of life seems to be one that has no parallel in Jewish thought, a subject to which we shall return.¹⁾

The words of our quotation are put on the lips of the Jewish multitude²⁾ to whom Jesus had spoken about working not for the food which perishes, accusing them of seeking him not because they saw signs but because they had eaten of the loaves and were filled. They ask him what to do to work the works of God; he replies that the work of God is to believe on him. They then ask him what sign he does, or what he works, that they may see and believe. Their fathers ate the manna. Then follows our quotation. Jesus replies that God, not Moses, gave them the bread from heaven. The quotation sets the stage for Jesus' discourse on the bread of life which follows and thus must be taken with what follows, not with what precedes it.

Jn, familiar with Jewish beliefs and traditions as reflected in the O. T., Philo, and Rabbinic literature, goes further than those with his own idea of Jesus himself as "the bread of life" (6: 35, 48) and "the living bread" (6: 51). Those terms, with the whole theme of chapter six, occur nowhere else in Jn and not before the point where the quotation is introduced. There is no Rabbinic parallel to Jesus as the bread of life.³⁾ Indeed, in developing the theme of Jesus as "the bread of life," Jn goes further than he had with his theme of "living water" in chapter four. Jn never reaches the point where he says that Jesus himself is "the living water,"⁴⁾ but he seems to come close to the idea with the parallelism of 6: 35. Our quotation gives Jn a good point of departure for the development of his theme.

The quotation itself appears to be a combination of Ex 16: 4 and Ps

¹⁾ See under Jn 7: 37 f. below. Cf. also Odeberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-244; Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (1955), pp. 154-157 and the many references in his footnotes; Barrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 f.; Str.-B., 2, pp. 480-484.

²⁾ The subject of the verbs throughout is third per. pl. and is probably meant to indicate "the Jews" in general since the term of Ἰουδαῖοι itself occurs in 6: 41, 52.

³⁾ See Str.-B., 2, pp. 482 f.

⁴⁾ On this point cf. Rengstorff on "ποταμός" in Kittel, *TWZNT*, 6, p. 607. Cf. Jn 4: 10 f.; 7: 38; Rev 7: 17; 21: 6; 22: 1, 17.

78: 24 and contains elements from both the Heb. and Gr. texts. ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is exactly the Heb. of Ex 16: 4 but not the LXX ἄρτους. It is not enough to say that "John's ἐκ τοῦ is closer to Nehemiah's ¹⁾ ἐξ than to the Psalm's genitive." ²⁾ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς is from either the Heb. or Gr. text of Ps 78: 24. φαγεῖν can be from either the Heb. or Gr. of Ps 78: 24 and could easily have been added accidentally or intentionally to the end of the quotation from the preceding line of the Ps. This would be more likely to happen if the LXX text were used since the word φαγεῖν occurs there at the end of the preceding line above the word αὐτοῖς which ends the line below it. Another point in favor of Jn's use of the LXX text of the Ps is that πτ of the MT is translated with ἄρτος only there in the O. T. However, Burney ³⁾ may be right when he says that in Ps 78: 24 the LXX's rendering of πτ by ἄρτον is dictated by recollection of Ex 16: 4 and that Jn's quotation is a free reminiscence of Ex 16: 4, 15, probably uninfluenced by the recollection of the Ps passage. He also adds that the ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ of Jn is closer to the Heb. of Ex 16: 4 than to the LXX pl. ἄρτους. ⁴⁾ On the other hand, the combination of the words manna and bread in the same verse of which the quotation is a part may indicate that he had the Ps passage in mind. In certain respects the thought and language of Jn seem to show some affinity to the addition to the text of Ex 16: 15 in the Targum Jon.: "It is the bread which was reserved for you from the beginning in heaven on high, and now Yahweh gave it to you to eat."

Perhaps this quotation can best be explained by saying that Jn had in mind Ex 16: 4, 15 and Ps 78: 24 and probably was familiar with both the Heb. and Gr. texts. He may have quoted his texts from memory or deliberately invented a quotation to suit his theological purpose for including the quotation in the first place. Either one of these explanations would in itself be sufficient to explain the differences in Jn from the O. T. texts and the omission of καί at the beginning of the quotation. His only motive seems to be to set the stage for the discourse of Jesus about the bread of life which follows. Jesus as the "bread of life" descends ⁵⁾ from heaven and gives life to the world (6: 33, 50). The one coming to Jesus, "the bread of life," shall not hunger,

¹⁾ From Neh 9: 15.

²⁾ Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁴⁾ Burney's view would explain Jn's omission of καί which occurs in both MT and LXX of Ps 78: 24.

⁵⁾ Cf. Targum Onk. of Ex 16: 4: "Behold, I will let the manna come down to you from heaven."

and the one who believes on him shall never thirst (6: 35). Jesus is "the living bread"; and "if anyone eat of this bread, he shall live forever" (6: 51). In this way Jesus is presented in strong contrast to Moses who was thought to be the first redeemer and was thought to have given the manna which the Jewish fathers ate in the wilderness and died (6: 49, 58).

CHAPTER FOUR

TAUGHT BY GOD

Jn 6:45

Texts

Jn 6: 45

ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·
καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκοὶ θεοῦ.

Is 54: 13 (MT)

וכל־בניך למודי יהוה

Is 54: 13 (LXX B)

καὶ θήσω . . . καὶ πάντας
τούς υἱούς σου διδασκοὺς θεοῦ.

Is 54: 13 (Targ. Jon.)

וכל בניך אלפין
באוריתא דיי

Jer 31: 34 (LXX B)

καὶ οὐ διδάξουσιν ἕκαστος τὸν
πολίτην αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν
ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων γινῶθι τὸν
κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με

Jer 31: 34 (MT)

ולא ילמדו עוד איש את־רעהו
ואיש את־אחיו לאמר דעו את־יהוה
כי־כולם ידעו אותי

Jer 31: 34 (Targ. Jon.)

ולא יילפון עוד גבר יתחבריה
וגבר יתאחוהי למימר דעו למדחל
מן קדם יי ארי כולהון ילפון למדע
דחלת

A part of the larger context of the previous quotation (6: 31), this one—like those in 7: 38; 10: 34; 8: 17; 13: 18; 15: 25—occurs on the lips of Jesus and is found nowhere else in the N. T. But cf. 1 Thess 4: 9 where Paul says: “for you yourselves are taught of God (θεοδιδάκτοι ἐστε) to love one another.”¹⁾ Although quotations from the prophets are introduced with different types of formulae,²⁾ the exact formula ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις occurs only here in the N. T. Perhaps the vague reference “in the prophets” does “indicate uncertainty regard-

¹⁾ Jn 6: 45 and 1 Thess 4: 9 are the only places where the expression “to be taught of God” occurs in the N. T. Cf. 1 Jn 2: 20-29; *Ep. of Barn.* 21: 6: γίνεσθε δὲ θεοδιδάκτοι.

²⁾ Cf., e.g., Mk 1: 2; Mt 1: 22; 2: 5, 17; 7: 12; 21: 4; Lk 1: 70; 3: 4; 24: 44; Jn 1: 23; 12: 15, 38, 40; 19: 37; Acts 2: 16; 3: 21; 7: 42; 24: 14; Rom 1: 2.

ing the exact source of the quotation," as Barrett suggests.¹⁾ Barrett also refers to Mt 2: 23 where the difficult saying, "He shall be called a Nazarene," is introduced with "through the prophets." Perhaps the same factor accounted for the textual change in Mk 1: 2 from "in Isaiah the prophet" to "in the prophets," but that may be only an attempt at correction since there is a double prophecy there. The note of uncertainty, or at least generality, is present also in the words, "the scriptures of the prophets," in Mt 26: 56.²⁾ On the other hand, there is no vagueness in the text introduced with the formula "in the prophets" in Acts 13: 40. Moreover, the source for this quotation is more certain than for some others in Jn. It may be that the reference is to the division of scripture known as "the Prophets" and regarded as a single whole, as, e.g., in Acts 7: 42; 13: 40; Lk 24: 44.³⁾

Is 54: 13 is Jn's main source,⁴⁾ but it is difficult to determine whether he used the Heb. or Gr. text. Barrett lists Jn 6: 45 among those quotations which may be based on either the Heb. or Gr. text.⁵⁾ Jn's πάντες and διδάκτοί in the nominative case may indicate that he was using a separate sentence as in the Heb. since in the LXX those words are in the accusative case as objects of the verb θήσω used in vs. 12. But the use of θεοῦ with the LXX instead of κυρίου for the Heb. יהוה may indicate influence from the LXX. Barrett says that John gives a sufficiently exact paraphrase, is probably dependent on the LXX, and that he does not use διδάκτορ elsewhere.⁶⁾ But διδάκτοί is a good translation of the Heb. לְמַדֵּי, so Barrett's argument for Jn's use of the LXX is not satisfactory any more than the fact that the word πάντες, e.g., occurs as subject in Jer 31: 34, part of a context which may have had a secondary influence on Jn.

With the view of Barrett contrast that of Burney who maintains that Jn, treating the statement as an independent sentence, is dependent upon the Heb. and not on the LXX but that the use of θεοῦ is probably due to LXX influence. If this be true, the natural inference, according to Burney, is that the quotation was originally made directly from the Heb. and afterwards modified by a copyist under LXX influence, possibly

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 245.

²⁾ Cf. Lk 1: 70; 18: 31; 24: 25, 44; Rom 1: 2; 2 Pet 3: 2 for similar expressions.

³⁾ Cf. Jn 1: 45; Acts 13: 15, 27; 15: 15; 24: 14; 26: 22, 27; 28: 23; Rom 3: 21.

⁴⁾ In addition cf. Ps 71: 17; 119: 171; Prov 4: 4, 11; Is 40: 14; Jer 24: 7; Mic 4: 2; Joel 2: 27; Hab 2: 14 and following pages.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

by the translator from Aramaic into Greek.¹⁾ The theory of translation from Aramaic into Greek seems to be pressing the point too far.

The Targum of Is 54: 13 is in accord with the Heb. and reads י"י. Perhaps Jn's use of μαθών in 6: 45b²⁾ shows influence from the Aram. אלה. But in the LXX μαθησάτω translates the Heb. אלה only in Prov 22: 25, which has no bearing on Jn here. μαθησάτω translates למד in Qal many times; in Pi. twice, Is 26: 9 and Jer 9: 5; למד twice, Is 8: 16 and Jer 13: 23. Again, Jn may be influenced by Jer 31: 33 f., perhaps even the Targum where the combination of ידע and אלה occur together. Jn has ἀκούω and μαθησάτω; but ἀκούω translates ידע in the LXX twice, Is 32: 4, where ἀκούω and μαθησάτω occur together, and Is 44: 9. Several factors in the context of Jn tend to indicate influence from the context of Jer 31, especially vss. 31-34. Cf. "in the last day" in Jn 6: 44 with "Behold, the days come" and "after those days" in Jer 31: 31, 33. Cf. also the whole of vs. 34 with the context of our quotation. There is also the use of ἐλκύω in Jer 31: 3, but it may be "unwise to lay much stress on this coincidence."³⁾ However, the quotation is given in the context of no one being able to come to Jesus unless the Father "draw (ἐλκύσῃ) him" (6: 44). Indeed, the vocabulary of the context in Jn seems to show influence from the passages of Is and Jer referred to above.⁴⁾ It may be said in passing that the context of both Is 54: 13, the main source of the quotation, and Jer 31: 31 ff. is eschatological. The context of Jn is also partly eschatological as is shown by the words, "And I will raise him up in the last day" (6: 44). But Jn's thought goes beyond the eschatological context.

The most important difference in Jn from both the Heb. and Gr. texts is the omission of בניך (τῶν υἱῶν σου) from the text of Is 54: 13. Jn adapts the quotation from Is to suit his own theology. In Is the author is describing the future splendor and security of the city of Zion when her people will be taught by the Lord himself. The theological view is national in scope. "Your sons" are sons of Zion. But in Jn 6: 45 the author's theological view is universal in scope. The note of universalism is found in Mic 4: 2, a text suggested as a secondary source for our quotation. In Jn the implication is clearly that *anyone* whom the

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 118. I might add that the LXX frequently uses θεός to translate יהוה; it is almost always so used in Prov and about 70 times in Is.

²⁾ Used only here and in 7: 15 in Jn.

³⁾ Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

⁴⁾ For the influence of O. T. contexts on writers of the N. T. cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (1952), *passim*, esp. pp. 126 f.

Father draws can come to Jesus. It is worth noting that in both Is and Jn the Lord himself is the cause of the response he desires from the people. Jn's theological motive alone is enough to explain the omission of "your sons," which, if included, would limit the application of Jesus' message to Jews only. The context of Jn supports this view: "Everyone who has heard from the Father and has learned comes to me" (6: 45 b); "The one who believes has eternal life" (6: 47); "If anyone eats of this bread, he shall live forever" (6: 51). Jn wanted to show that Jesus' message of "the bread of life" was not limited to the children of Zion. The emphasis, therefore, is on πάντες.

If Jn does show acquaintance with the Targums, especially of Is, it is his language rather than his thought which shows influence. Learning the Law of the Lord is of no concern to Jn.

The whole context in Jn, of which this quotation and the one in 6: 31 are a part, seems to show influence from several places in the O. T. other than the ones from which he is quoting directly. The idea of God drawing men occurs in Hos 11: 4 and Jer 31: 3. Jn may be consciously trying to go beyond certain ideas contained in several O. T. texts of which he is aware. In general cf., e.g., Is 40: 14; Jer 24: 7; Joel 2: 27; Hab 2: 14. The way to knowledge of God and to life are not through the law and wisdom as in Prov 4: 1-13 nor through God himself as in Mic 4: 2 or even in Is 54: 13. God now draws people to Jesus whom God sent; and having heard from God and having learned, they come to Jesus who is "the bread of life" for *all* who believe. Thus there is a real unity of thought in the whole context of chapter six of which the quotations in vss. 31 and 45 are only a point of departure for Jn's own theological interpretation of Jesus.

Finally, there seem to be two alternatives in explaining Jn's reading in this quotation: (1) As one trained in the Jewish scriptures, Jn shows a thorough acquaintance with them and in a creative way adapts them to suit his theological purpose for including a specific quotation in the first place. (2) Jn drew from his memory a quotation from either the Heb. or Gr. text—and possibly Targum—of Is 54: 13 to help explain and give support from scripture to his understanding of Jesus. Presumably the factor of memory would in itself be sufficient to explain all the differences in the text of Jn. However, in view of Jn's treatment of his sources in general, the former alternative seems the more likely one here.

CHAPTER FIVE

RIVERS OF LIVING WATER

Jn 7:37, 38

Texts

Jn 7:37 f.

ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με
καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ,
καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ
τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ βέουσουσιν
ὕδατος ζῶντος.

Is 12:3 (MT)

ושאבתם-מים בששון
ממעיני הישועה

Is 12:3 (LXX B)

καὶ ἀντλήσετε ὕδωρ μετ'
εὐφροσύνης ἐκ τῶν πηγῶν
τοῦ σωτηρίου

Is 43:19 f. (LXX B)

ἐν τῇ ἀνδρῷ ποταμούς· . . . ὅτι
ἔδωκα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὕδωρ καὶ ποταμούς
ἐν τῇ ἀνδρῷ, ποτίσαι τὸ γένος μου
τὸ ἐκλεκτόν

Is 43:19 f. (MT)

בישמון נהרות . . . כי
נתתי במדבר מים נהרות
בישמן להשקות עמי בחירי

Is 44:3 (LXX B)

ὅτι ἐγὼ δώσω ὕδωρ ἐν δίψει τοῖς
πορευομένοις ἐν ἀνδρῷ, ἐπιθήσω τὸ
πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου

Is 44:3 (MT)

כי אצק-מים על-צמא
ונזלים על-יבשה
אצק רוחי על-זרעך

Is 55:1 f. (LXX B)

οἱ διψῶντες, πορεύεσθε ἐφ' ὕδωρ . . .
καὶ φάγετε

Is 55:1 f. (MT)

הוי כל-צמא לכו למים . . .
ואכלו

Is 58:11 (LXX B)

καὶ ἔσται ὡς κῆπος μεθύων καὶ ὡς πηγὴ
ἥν μὴ ἐξέλιπεν ὕδωρ·

Is 58:11 (MT)

והיית כגן רוח וכמוצא מים
אשר לא-יכוזבו מימיו

Zech 14: 8 (LXX B)

καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελεύσεται
ὕδωρ ζῶν ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Zech 14: 8 (MT)

והיה ביום ההוא יצאו
מים חיים מירושלם

Jer 2: 13 (LXX B)

ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον, πηγὴν ὕδατος ζωῆς

Jer. 2: 13 (MT)

אתי עזבו מקור מים חיים

Jer 17: 13 (LXX B)

ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ζωῆς τὸν κύριον

Jer 17: 13 (MT)

כי עזבו מקור מים חיים את־יהוה

Prov 18: 4 (LXX B)

ὕδωρ βαθὺ λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνδρός,
ποταμὸς δὲ ἀναπηδύει καὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς.

Prov 18: 4 (MT)

מים עמקים דברי פי־איש
נחל גבע מקור חכמה

I QS 4: 20 f.

להתם כול רוח עולה מתכמו בשרו ולטהרו ברוח קודש
מכול עלילות רשעה ויז עליו רוח אמת כמי גדה

CD 2: 12 f.

ויודיעם ביד משיחו רוח קדשו

I QH 12: 11 ff.

ואני משכיל ידעתיכה אלי ברוח
אשר נתתה בי . . . ברוח קדשכה
[פ]תחתה לתוכי דעת ברז שכלכה ומעין גבור []־יך

I QH 7: 6 f.

אודכה אדוני כי . . . ורוח קודשכה הניפותה בי

I QH 17: 25 f.

כי רוח בש [] עבדך הניפותה רוח קודש [] על עבדך

I QH 8: 16 f.

ואתה אלי שמשה בפי כיורה גשם לכול
[] ומבוע מים חיים ולא יכזב

The words of the quotation in Jn 7: 38 are spoken by Jesus at the feast of Tabernacles. It is found nowhere else in the N. T. The formula

καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή is used only here in the N. T. In Jn ἡ γραφή as part of a formula occurs also in 7: 42; 13: 18; 17: 12; 19: 24; 19: 28; 19: 36; 19: 37. γραφή (a) or γραφαί (b) with πληρώω (ἔνα) occurs in Mt 26: 54 (b); 26: 56 (b, ἔνα); Mk 14: 49 (b, ἔνα); 15: 28 (a); Lk 4: 21 (a); with εἶπεν nowhere except Jn 7: 38 (a); 7: 42 (a); with λέγω in Mk 15: 28 (a); Jn 19: 37 (a); Rom 4: 3 (a); 9: 17 (a); 10: 11 (a); 11: 2 (a); Gal 4: 30 (a); 1 Tim 5: 18 (a); Ja 2: 23 (a); 4: 5 (a).

This quotation is the most difficult one in Jn. The first difficulty is that of trying to find a definite source or sources used by the author (or Jesus). The evidence at present is insufficient to determine the exact O. T. source or sources and text or texts used. The texts of the most likely direct sources are given above. In addition to those and others referred to in the succeeding pages, some or all of the following passages may have influenced the thought and language of the author: Dt 8: 15 f.; Ps 36: 9 f.; 46: 5; Joel 3: 18; Zech 13: 1; Prov 5: 15 f.; 18: 4 (LXX); Sir 15: 3; 24: 28-32; Song 4: 15; Is 32: 1 f.; 35: 5-7; 41: 18; 43: 19-21; 49: 10; Jer 2: 13; 17: 13; Ezek 36: 25-27; 47: 1-12; Jub 8: 19; 1 En 17: 4; 22: 9; 96: 6; Rev 7: 16 f.; 21: 6; 22: 1, 17.

A second difficulty is that of punctuation. The text of Jn 7: 37 f. may be punctuated as in the text of Nestle or as indicated by the variants. The Old Latin codices d and e, with some early Christian writers, put a stop after ἐμέ and connect πινέτω with ὁ πιστεύων so that αὐτοῦ is understood of Jesus and not of the believer. This alternate punctuation is followed by some modern commentators. The arguments for it do not seem conclusive: the difficulty of finding an O. T. text; the rhythm of the clause and parallelism are improved by punctuating and reading as Bultmann,¹⁾ Burney,²⁾ Torrey,³⁾ and others do; and the reference to scripture may then be applied either to what precedes or to what follows, and the pronoun αὐτοῦ may refer to Christ or to the believer.

Arguments for the punctuation either way and for the interpretation of αὐτοῦ as referring either to Jesus or to the believer may be supported by evidence from Johannine style and thought. In favor of the alternate punctuation are the ideas of Jn that Jesus does give "living water" (4: 10 ff.), and whoever drinks it will never thirst. Jesus is the "bread of life," and the one coming to him shall not hunger, and the one believing on him shall never thirst (6: 35).⁴⁾ Jesus himself breathes the spirit

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 228.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 109-111.

³⁾ *The Four Gospels* (1947), pp. 200 f.

⁴⁾ Cf. also 6: 51 ff.; 19: 34; 1 Jn 5: 6-8.

upon his disciples (20: 22). On the other hand, placing a stop after *πινέτω* results in a *nominativus pendens* with *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ* resumed in *αὐτοῦ*. This is typical Johannine Greek; cf., e.g., 1: 12; 6: 39; 8: 45; 15: 2; 17: 2.¹⁾ It also seems more natural and makes better sense for the *πινέτω* to go with *ἐάν τις διψᾷ* than with *ὁ πιστεύων*. Even in the discourse with the Samaritan woman the "living water" which Jesus gives "will become a spring of water welling up to eternal life *in him*" who drinks it (4: 14). Those who believe are like Jesus in whom they believe and stand in the same relationship to him as he does to God (17: 8-10, 20-23).²⁾ In 20: 22 where Jesus breathes the spirit upon his disciples, the disciples are told that if they forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven and if they retain the sins of any, they are retained.

The fact remains that regardless of the punctuation,³⁾ one's interpretation, and whether the quotation is composed of *ἐάν τις . . . εἰς ἐμέ . . .* or *ποταμοὶ . . . ζῶντος*, there is no particular O. T. passage which satisfies the quotation. The passages and texts listed above are given under the assumption that the quotation is *ποταμοὶ . . . ζῶντος*.⁴⁾ It is even more difficult to find O. T. passages to satisfy the quotation beginning with *ἐάν τις*. Cf., however, Is 44: 3; 49: 10; 55: 1; Ps 42: 2; 63: 1; 143: 6.

No passage satisfies *ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας*. In the Heb. O. T. the seat of man's emotions is within, and the words *בטן*, *לב*, *מעם*, *נפש*, and *קרב* are usually used to convey this feeling. The LXX is not consistent in its translation of these words, nor in its use of *κοιλία* to translate any one of them except that it never translates *לב* and *נפש*, and never *קרב* in the sense of within as the seat of feelings or emotions with *κοιλία*. It is, therefore, impossible to tell what Heb. word Jn had in mind when he used *κοιλία*. *κοιλία* mostly translates *בטן* and *מעם*, or some other word, in the sense of "intestines," "belly," "womb." It is not frequently used in the LXX to translate any word meaning "inside" or "within" in the sense of the seat of the emotions. It is probably (some

¹⁾ Cf. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 1, p. 69; 2, pp. 423 ff. and bibliographical references listed there; Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (1961), p. 244.

²⁾ For similar ideas cf. 5: 38-41; 6: 57; 9: 4; 10: 25-30; 11: 25 f.; 13: 34 f.; 14: 12, 18-24; 15: 9 f.; 21: 21; *et al.*

³⁾ See more recently P⁶⁶ which has a full stop after *πινέτω* and K. H. Kuhn ("St John VII. 37-8," *NTS* 4 (1957), pp. 63-65) who presents additional evidence for the alternate punctuation.

⁴⁾ So, e.g., RSV, *Challoner-Rheims Version*, and *NEB*. The *King James Version* and the translations of Goodspeed and Moffatt are as ambiguous on this point as the Greek text.

are doubtful cases) so used in most of the following places: for **בטן** in Prov 20: 27; 20: 30; 26: 22; Hab 3: 16; Job 15: 35; for **מעים** in Job 30: 27; Ps 21: 15; 39: 9 (א ATAq.); Song 5: 4; Is 16: 11; Jer 4: 19; Lam 1: 20. Some interesting examples will show the LXX usage.

לב and **בטן** are parallel in Prov 22: 17 f. and are both translated with *καρδία*. In Job 32: 18 f. **בטן** is twice translated with *γαστήρ*. In Prov 31: 10 and 44: 26 **נפש** and **בטן** are translated with *ψυχή* and *γαστήρ*; in 20: 27 **בטן** with *κοιλία*; so in Hab 3: 16. In Is 16: 11 **מעים** and **קרב** are translated with *κοιλία* and *τὰ ἐντός μου*. In Jer 4: 19 **מעים** (2), **לב** (2), and **נפש** are translated with *κοιλία* (2), *καρδία*, *ψυχή*, *καρδία* (LXX adds an extra *ψυχή* here); in 23: 9 **לב** and **קרב** are translated with *καρδία* and *ἐν ἐμοί*; so in Ps 55: 5, but in Ps 39: 4 the same Heb. is translated with *καρδία* and *ἐντός μου*; so in 109: 22. In Jer 31: 20 for **מעים** Aq. has *κοιλία* where LXX B differs from MT. In Job 30: 27 **מעים** is translated with *κοιλία*; so also in Song 5: 4. In Lam 1: 20 **מעים** and **לב** are translated with *κοιλία* and *καρδία*; in 2: 11 **מעים** with *καρδία*. In Ps 103: 1 f. **נפש**, **קרב**, and **נפש** are translated with *ψυχή*, *τὰ ἐντός*, and *ψυχή*. In Jer 4: 14 **לב** and **קרב** with *καρδία* and *ἐν σοί*.

In the O. T. the Torah is within (the heart). "Thy law is within my heart (**בהיך מעי**), ἐν μέσῳ τῆς καρδίας [*κοιλίας*, **א**AT] μου) . . . I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart" (**בתוך לבי**), ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου) (Ps 40: 9-11). "I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart (**בקרנם ועל-לכם**), εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν [*καρδίαν* **א***] αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν) will I write it" (Jer 31 : 33).

These passages enable us to understand somewhat the general background which may have partly motivated Jn to use the quotation. But they do nothing to help us locate the specific O. T. passage from which the quotation comes, nor the text (Heb. or Gr.) used, and little, if anything, to clarify Jn's understanding of *κοιλία*. In an attempt to solve the problem of *ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας* in the quotation, various proposals have been offered.

Bernard ¹⁾ says that the use of *κοιλία* is "in accordance with the Semitic habit of expressing emphasis by mentioning some part of the body . . . 'Out of his belly' is only an emphatic way of saying, 'From him shall flow.' " Str.-B. ²⁾ give Rabbinic evidence to show that the Heb. word **גוף**, "body," may be used to mean "person" or "self." But this word would naturally be translated into Gr. with *σῶμα* or *ψυχή*, not *κοιλία*.

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, 1, p. 283.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2, p. 492.

The explanation of Hoskyns¹⁾ is too far-fetched. "The thought of the author is conditioned by the picture of the water flowing from the *side* of the crucified Lord (xix. 34), *belly* being a synonym for *side*, but having also in contemporary usage, like *heart* or *reins*, a conventional significance as the seat of the emotions." Julius A. Bewer, in commenting on Is 58: 11 f., suggests reading "thy belly" or "body," as quoted in Jn 7: 38 (apparently for מִמֶּנּוּ in vs. 12), and inserting it in vs. 11 before "like a spring of water." This is an interesting solution to a textual problem in Is, but I can find no place in the Heb. O. T. where מֶנְעַן is used in the sense of "from within" —but cf. מִמֶּנּוּ in Ps 51: 13—or the innermost part, such as "belly" or "body," as Bewer suggests. The suggestion is clearly made under the influence of Jn 7: 38.²⁾

Other more detailed solutions to the problem are those maintained by Burney and Torrey, who try to determine the original Aramaic of Jesus' words and then translate accordingly. Burney³⁾ argues that the quotation is a free combination of several O. T. passages "which speak of a river of living waters which, in the Messianic age, is to issue from the Temple-mount, and to become the source of life and healing far and wide." He continues by saying that "our Lord" had in mind principal passages like Ezek 47: 1-12, especially vs. 9 which was taken up by Joel 4: 18 and Zech 14: 8 and that in using the words ἐκ-πινέτω he was using Is 55: 1 ff. and Jer 2: 13. Burney then discusses the main difficulty, "out of his belly shall flow," etc. and admits that it cannot be connected with any O. T. passage. He proceeds to "solve" the difficulty with the assumption that the passage has been translated from Aramaic. Joel speaks of a "fountain," Heb. מַעְיָן; and the word is the same in Aramaic (used, e.g., in Targum of Ps 104: 10; Prov 5: 16; 8: 28). The Aramaic for "belly" or "bowels" is מַעֲזָן, Heb. מַעֲיִם (used, e.g., in Dan 2: 32). In an unvocalized text מַעֲזָן, "belly," and מַעְיָן, "fountain," would be identical. Adopting the word for "fountain" and connecting the clause

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 323.

²⁾ *The Book of Isaiah* (1950), 2, p. 58 n. I might say that if one wants to invent a text in Is 58: 11 f. to satisfy the quotation in Jn 7: 38, it would be better to read מִמֶּנּוּ for מִמֶּנּוּ, as Kittel suggests, and insert it in vs. 11 before "like a spring of water." Perhaps reading מִמֶּנּוּ would be even better because in 1 Chron 17: 11 מִמֶּנּוּ is translated in LXX by ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου. In the parallel passage in 2 Sam 7: 12 MT reads מִמֶּנּוּ where the LXX also reads ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου. However, the LXX in 1 Chron 17: 11 was probably influenced by the passage in 2 Sam 7: 12. At least such a reading would have some support in the O. T.

³⁾ C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1922), pp. 109-111. Quotations here and elsewhere by permission of the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

"He that believeth in me" with the preceding word, he translates from the hypothetical Aramaic as follows:

He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me;
And let him drink that believeth in Me.
As the Scripture hath said,
Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters.

Burney concludes his argument by maintaining that the quotation of scripture which follows the parallelism completely summarizes the main conceptions of Ezek, Joel, and Zech. "When the passage was translated from Aramaic into Greek, מן מעין was taken to mean, 'from the belly'; and this was connected with 'he that believeth in Me', and was therefore rendered, 'from *his* belly'." ¹⁾

In three works C. C. Torrey ²⁾ deals with this quotation. He, like Burney, accepts the alternate punctuation but rejects Burney's translation because "there is . . . no way in which the two Aram. words suggested by him could have been confused in the present passage; and the text which he reconstructed (p. 110) is neither good Aramaic nor comes anywhere near accounting for our Grk." ³⁾ Torrey translates as follows: "Whoever thirsts, let him come to me, and let him drink who believes on me. As the scripture says, Out of the midst of Her [i.e., Jerusalem] shall flow rivers of living water." ⁴⁾ The translation, "Out of the midst of Her," involves only "the pointing מנה instead of the (naturally expected) מנה." ⁵⁾ Torrey says that the citation was free and for substance only, as so often, ⁶⁾ and that the fact of mis-translation, its cause, and the reason for the precise word chosen are alike obvious. ⁷⁾ The Aramaic word in question is the regular word for the "midst" of a city, both in the O. T. (Ezra 4: 15) and Targums (Ps 46: 6, "God is in the midst of her," מנה). Used also very frequently of human beings, it always means the "belly" or "bowels," i.e., exactly κοιλία. ⁸⁾ Torrey gives additional examples (Targ. Lev. 1: 13; 3: 3; Prov 20: 30; Sir

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

²⁾ "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John," *HTR*, 16 (1923), pp. 305-334; *The Four Gospels; Our Translated Gospels*.

³⁾ *Our Translated Gospels* (Harper, 1936), p. 110.

⁴⁾ *The Four Gospels* (Harper, 1947), pp. 200 f. So also in *Our Translated Gospels*.

⁵⁾ *HTR*, 16, p. 340.

⁶⁾ In a later work, *Documents of the Primitive Church* (Harper, 1941), p. 46, he says that Jn 7: 38 is the best example in any gospel of a quotation for substance only and for free paraphrase in Aramaic.

⁷⁾ *The Four Gospels*, p. 323.

⁸⁾ *HTR*, 16, p. 340.

10: 9)¹⁾ and adds that the Gr. translator, having made his false beginning with "He who believes," had no choice but to read his Aram. text (the very same consonants) with the mas. suffix, *gawēh*, instead of fem. suffix *gawah*, and to write "out of his belly." "Every step in his unfortunate proceeding is plain, and so also is the true reading which he so completely missed." Torrey says that the scripture to which Jesus refers is definitely messianic. In the Coming Age a great stream of living water, with its source at the temple, will flow from Jerusalem and bless the land (Joel 4: 18; Zech 14: 8; Ezek 47: 1 ff.; Ps 46: 5-8). It is to the last passage that Jesus refers, as is shown by two features of his free quotation: this is the only case in which the stream is called a *river*; the next vs. of the Ps contains the phrase "in the midst of her" (i.e., Jerusalem), and those words would naturally be in the mind of one who referred to this picture of the holy city.²⁾

A theory similar to those of Burney and Torrey is that of J. R. Harris, who suggests that there was an error in reading two Syriac words which vary only slightly, one the word for "belly" and the other the word for "throne."³⁾ He believes that in a primitive book of *Testimonies* this was a composite quotation made up of Zech 14: 8 and Jer 3: 17: "They shall call Jerusalem the Lord's throne," and that the combination appeared as "Living water shall go forth from the throne of the Lord." There is evidence for such a combination in Rev 22: 1, 17. Thus Harris supports his theory of early Christian Testimonies.⁴⁾

Such theories are both interesting and ingenious but do little or nothing to fix the specific O. T. passage or combination of passages or the text which Jn had in mind. From the context it appears certain that neither in Aramaic nor in Greek would Jn be interested in water flowing from Jerusalem or from the throne of the Lord. To adopt any one of the theories presented would do violence to the whole context in Jn. The quotation as it stands completely satisfies the context, which makes it plain that Jn had in mind the spirit flowing from the believer—or, perhaps, from Christ. Jn himself makes this quite clear when he says: "This he said about the spirit which those *who believed* on him were about to receive."⁵⁾

¹⁾ *Our Translated Gospels*, p. III.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

³⁾ "Rivers of Living Water," *Expositor*, 20 (1920), pp. 196-202.

⁴⁾ See J. R. Harris and V. Burch, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (1916-1920).

⁵⁾ According to 17: 20 and 20: 29 those who believed would include not only his present disciples but all who were to believe through them.

This brings us to the problem of "rivers of living water" and the association of water with the spirit. The words ποταμοὶ ὕδατος ζῶντος,¹⁾ like ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας, occur nowhere in the O. T. Commentators are not so much concerned with the former words as with the latter, probably because there are passages in the Heb. and/or Gr. O. T. which come closer to them. But because Burney, Torrey, and others have failed to study these words in light of the context, they have failed to comprehend the fuller meaning of the quotation. מים חיים, with corresponding Gr. forms, occur in MT and LXX in Gen 21:19; 26:19; Lev 14:5 f., 50-52; Num 5:17 (LXX only); 19:17; Jer 2:13; Song 4:15; Zech 14:8. Cf. especially φρέαρ ὕδατος ζῶντος in Gen 21:19 (MT lacks "living"); 26:19; Song 4:15; πηγὴ ζωῆς in Prov 10:11; 13:14; 14:27; 16:22; 18:4; Sir 21:13; Ps 35:10 (Heb. מקור חיים in all except Prov 18:4).

Rabbinic scholars seldom interpreted מים חיים in the O. T. symbolically but did so occasionally.²⁾ On the other hand, מים alone is frequently interpreted allegorically, several times with reference to the holy spirit. For example, pSukka 5, 55^a, 42: R. Jehos. b. Levi (c. 250) said: "Why does one call it (the place [lit., "house"] of merrymaking in the temple at the Feast of Tabernacles) 'place of drawing'? Because from there one draws the holy spirit (spirit of prophecy)." Cf. Is 12:3. מים is interpreted allegorically mostly with reference to the Torah.³⁾ Several interesting examples follow. In Sir 15:3 the Torah is spoken of as the "bread of understanding" and "water of wisdom." In CD 5:3 the Torah is spoken of symbolically as "a well of many waters"; in 9:28 B as "the spring of living waters"; cf. here CD 8:4-6.

We come now to the appropriate point for a discussion of the context of our quotation, especially with reference to the Feast of Tabernacles in 7:37 and the giving of the spirit in 7:39. This context, which, like every context in Jn is so important for the study of the quotation within it, has its setting at the Feast of Tabernacles. The ritual of the feast may, in part, have suggested to Jn at least the idea, if not the language, of the quotation. Whether the last day, the great day, of the feast was the seventh—as Str.-B.,⁴⁾ e.g., and others argue—or the eighth—as Hoskyns,⁵⁾ Bernard,⁶⁾ Barrett,⁷⁾ and others suggest—cannot be decided

¹⁾ But the words ὕδατος ζῶντος do occur in LXX $\aleph^c$ $\aleph^d$ $\aleph^e$ $\aleph^f$ $\aleph^g$ $\aleph^h$ $\aleph^i$ $\aleph^j$ $\aleph^k$ $\aleph^l$ $\aleph^m$ $\aleph^n$ $\aleph^o$ $\aleph^p$ $\aleph^q$ $\aleph^r$ $\aleph^s$ $\aleph^t$ $\aleph^u$ $\aleph^v$ $\aleph^w$ $\aleph^x$ $\aleph^y$ $\aleph^z$ of Jer 2:13.

²⁾ Jer 2:13; 17:13; Zech 14:8 gave occasion for it; see Str.-B., 3, pp. 854-856.

³⁾ For references see Str.-B., 2, pp. 433-436.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2, pp. 799-805, 808 f. and note *ad loc.*

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 320.

⁶⁾ *Op. cit.*, 1, p. 280.

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 269.

with certainty. For a good summary of the arguments *pro* and *con* see Barrett,¹⁾ who concludes that it is doubtful whether Jn was deeply concerned about the matter and possible that he was quite unaware of the question raised by his words.

It seems reasonably certain that Jn was partly influenced by ceremonies connected with the Feast of Tabernacles, particularly the libation of water with the recitation of Is 12: 3—"Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation"—and its symbolical interpretation of "drawing" the holy spirit.²⁾ But the evidence for the ceremony is entirely Rabbinic and late, there being no reference to it in the O. T. or Josephus. Nor is there any reference to the drinking of the water, only to the drawing of it; and the water theme occurs in Johannine thought where there is no association with the Feast of Tabernacles. Other O. T. passages used during the Feast of Tabernacles, some of which may also have influenced Jn's thinking, were Zech 14 and 1 Kgs 8 (with Is 12: 3; Ezek 47: 1 ff.; Zech 13: 1).³⁾

In post-exilic and Rabbinic Judaism Jerusalem was thought of as the "navel" of the earth with Mount Zion as its center.⁴⁾ It is conceivable that Jn intentionally and creatively transferred the source of the living water from Jerusalem (Zech 14: 8) to Jesus and then to the believer. The passages listed above would have assisted him in the process. The context as it now stands, however, gives no hint that Jn was concerned with water flowing from Jerusalem or from the throne of the Lord.

I have suggested that Jn may have been somewhat influenced by the ceremonies connected with the Feast of Tabernacles, especially the libation of water and its symbolical interpretation of the out-pouring of the holy spirit. If that is true, it seems likely that because of their use at the Feast such passages as Is 12: 3 and Zech 14: 8 were in the mind of Jn when he wrote down his quotation. At the same time he may also have thought of Is 44: 3 with the pouring of water upon him who is thirsty and the pouring of the spirit upon the seed of the servant.

This brings us to the consideration of the second aspect of the context, the giving of the spirit. The idea of the spirit is the chief motive behind the use of this quotation according to the writer of the gospel: "But

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

²⁾ See G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 2, pp. 43-48; Str.-B., 2, pp. 774-812.

³⁾ See I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (1924), p. 54; Str.-B., 2, pp. 799-805; H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (1923), pp. 64-67.

⁴⁾ Cf., e.g., Zech 14: 8; Ezek 38: 12; Sanh 37a; Jub 8: 19.

this he said about the spirit which they who believed on him were about to receive; for the spirit was not yet (given) because Jesus was not yet glorified" (7: 39). The living water represents the spirit (or holy spirit; here πνεῦμα is probably the equivalent of πνεῦμα ἅλιον—cf. the textual variant) which now proceeds from Jesus but after his glorification will proceed from the believer as well.

At times Jn seems to think that the spirit (or holy spirit) was confined to Jesus himself.¹⁾ Jesus, upon whom John the Baptist had apparently seen the πνεῦμα descend, etc., baptizes ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; but the Baptist baptizes ἐν ὕδατι (1: 33). Cf. also 14: 26; 16: 7; 20: 22.²⁾ Yet Jn could hardly have denied the previous existence of the spirit nor its efficacy in the prophets. But the Jews believed that the efficacy of the spirit had ceased with the cessation of O. T. prophecy. "R. Abba says: . . . After the later prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi had died, the Holy Spirit departed from Israel . . ." ³⁾ Even some Biblical writers looked for a future outpouring; cf. Joel 2: 28 f.; Prov 1: 23; Is 11: 2; 32: 15; 42: 1; 44: 3; 61: 1; Ezek 37: 14; 39: 29; Acts 2: 17 f.; 19: 2. Jn may mean that the spirit was not yet given or experienced in the characteristic Christian manner until the end of Jesus' life and work. According to Jn 14: 16 f., 26; 15: 26; 20: 22, after Jesus' glorification, he and/or the Father would send the holy spirit. This corresponds with the relative silence of the Synoptics concerning the spirit and such passages as those in Acts 2.

Jn had more to say about the spirit either because he wrote during a later time and from a later point of view or because he stood closer to a tradition where the conception of the spirit was strong, as in the community of Qumran. In the literature of that community we find the use of the words water and spirit in the same context and the spirit spoken of in terms which are characteristically applied to water (e.g., "to sprinkle" and "to pour").⁴⁾ Several passages from the literature of Qumran are important for our understanding of this quotation and its whole context.

With the combination of water and the (holy) spirit in Jn cf. the combination of the two in 1QS 4: 20 f. "To abolish every evil spirit from

¹⁾ Contrast such passages as 3: 5, 6, 8; 4: 23; 6: 63; cf. also Jn 16: 13; 1 Jn 3: 24; 4: 13.

²⁾ Cf. also Lk 24: 49; Acts 1: 5, 8, 13.

³⁾ Yoma I, p. 41, trans. by Leo Yung in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by I. Epstein (1938).

⁴⁾ For the association of these terms with baptism in the Qumran community see John A. T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," *HTR* 50 (1957), pp. 175-191.

the midst of his flesh, and to cleanse him through a Holy Spirit from all wicked practices, sprinkling upon him a Spirit of truth as purifying water" ¹⁾ Cf. here such O. T. passages as Is 32: 15; 44: 3; Ezek 36: 25-27; 39: 29; Joel 2: 28 f.; also Mk 1: 8; Mt 3: 11; Lk 3: 16; Acts 1: 5, 8; 2: 17 f.; 1 Cor 12: 13; Jn 1: 33; 3: 5; Tit 3: 5f. In each of these passages either water and the spirit are directly associated or the spirit is spoken of in figures symbolic of water, for example, "to pour out," "to drink," "to baptize with."

Another important passage which throws light on the context in Jn is CD 2: 12: "And to make (or: and he made) known to them by the hand of His anointed ones His holy spirit and shew them truth." ²⁾ Rabin takes the term משיחו ³⁾ as "the prophets" and refers to Ps 105: 15 where the two terms are parallel. This interpretation seems altogether likely in view of 1QS 1: 3 and especially 8: 15 f. Cf. also Ezek 38: 17; 1QpHab 2: 9; 7: 5; Rev 10: 7. Rabin's interpretation may throw some light on the context of Jn 7: 38. In 7: 39 Jn interprets Jesus' statement of vs. 38 for his readers in view of his own thoroughly Jewish background. But Jesus' hearers needed no explanation because they naturally associated his words about living water with the spirit and further associated the whole phenomenon with the prophet who was to come. "Having heard these words, some of the crowd said, 'This is truly the prophet.'" If one translates משיחו simply as "his anointed one," that is, "his messiah," ⁴⁾ the comments of the others of Jesus' hearers become understandable. "Others said, 'This is the Christ'" (7: 41).

Dt 18: 15 ff. came to be interpreted messianically as we know from 1 Macc 4: 46; 14: 41; Test. of Ben. 9: 2; Jn 1: 21, 25; 6: 14; 7: 40; Acts 3: 22; 7: 37. The idea of the fulfillment of Dt 18 is found in the N. T. clearly only in Jn and Acts.⁵⁾ Cf. the Qumran fragment of *Testimonia* where a quotation from Dt 18 also occurs.⁶⁾

¹⁾ Trans. from W. H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *BASOR, Supplementary Studies*, Nos. 10-12 (1951), p. 16.

²⁾ Trans. from Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (1954), p. 8.

³⁾ T. H. Gaster interprets the term as "the anointed priests, custodians, and teachers of the Law" (*The Dead Sea Scriptures* (1956), p. 100, n. 7).

⁴⁾ Contrast K. G. Kuhn who makes a good case for a pl., "his anointed ones" ("The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (1957), ed. Krister Stendahl, pp. 59 f.).

⁵⁾ The prophecy of Mal 4: 5 that Elijah would come before the Day of the Lord is alluded to in Mk 6: 15; 8: 28; 9: 11 f.; Mt 16: 14; 17: 10-12; Lk 9: 8, 19; Jn 1: 21, 25. In some of these passages one may also see an allusion to Dt 18, but the evidence is not nearly so clear as in Jn and Acts.

⁶⁾ See J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 174-187.

In IQS 9: 11 the coming of the prophet and the messiah(s) are linked together: *עד בוא נביא ומשיח אהרן ישראל*. I would interpret the prophet and messiah(s) here as separate persons with Gaster,¹⁾ against Brownlee.²⁾ The fact that in CD (6QD) 19: 10 f. (9: 10); 20: 1 (9: 29); 12: 23 f. (15: 4); 14: 19 (18: 8) the messiah himself is to come from Aaron and Israel seems to be evidence enough to justify this view. On the other hand, the parallelism of "anointed ones" and "prophets" in Ps 105: 15 (1 Chron 16: 22) gives some basis for equating the two. However, cf. Hab 3: 13 where "thy anointed one" is parallel to "thy people." Cf. also Acts 3: 22-26 where the "prophet" and the "servant" are probably equated and both titles applied to Jesus.

It is clear from the passages above that both in the O. T. and the Scrolls from Qumran the spirit was associated with the prophets and the messiah.³⁾ In Jn 7: 40 f. the author shows acquaintance with both these ideas; and nowhere else in the N. T. is the idea of the coming of the prophet and the messiah as separate individuals and the association of the spirit with them so clear as in the context of our quotation.⁴⁾ Cf. now especially P⁶⁶ where in Jn 7: 40-42 and 7: 43, 52 the terms *ὁ προφήτης* and *ὁ χριστός* clearly refer to two different persons.

According to CD 2: 11 f. the messiah (or prophet—the same phenomenon was true for either or both) himself possesses the (holy) spirit, and he, in turn, pours it out upon his followers. This is exactly the idea of Jn except that after Jesus' glorification the spirit is to be given to Christian believers themselves, not only to special servants of the Lord as formerly. This new element in Jn is original with him. The passage IQH 12: 11 f. also throws further light on the whole context of Jn 7: 38 ff. I reproduce here the translations of two scholars:

Ich aber als ein Einsichtiger habe dich erkannt, mein

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 58, 99, note 71; but cf. p. 5.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 35, note 19. In later articles Brownlee seems to have changed his mind; cf. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 (1956-57), pp. 12-30; *NTS* 3 (1957-58), pp. 195-210.

³⁾ The spirit is also associated with the Lord's servant in both O. T. and Scrolls; cf., e.g., Is 42: 1; 44: 3; IQH 13: 18-20; 16.

⁴⁾ Cf., however, the Synoptic idea of the Baptist and the passages listed above. In the gospels both the titles "prophet" and "messiah" are applied to Jesus. For prophet cf. Mk 6: 15; 8: 28; Mt 13: 57; 14: 5; 16: 14; 21: 11, 46; Lk 1: 76; 7: 16; 9: 8, 19; 13: 33; 24: 19; Jn 4: 19; 6: 14; 7: 40; 9: 17; for Christ or messiah cf. Mk 8: 29; 14: 61; Mt 16: 16, 20; 26: 68; 27: 17, 22; Lk 4: 41; 9: 20; 23: 2; 24: 46; Jn 1: 41; 4: 29, 42; 7: 26, 41; 11: 27. Cf. also "prophet" and "king" in Jn 6: 14; "Christ, the King" in Mk 15: 32. See F. W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-examination," *JBL* 68 (1949), pp. 285-299.

Gott, durch den Geist, 12) den du in mich gegeben
 hast . . . Durch deinen heiligen Geist 13) hast du meinem
 Inneren Erkenntnis eröffnet bezüglich deiner
 geheimnisvollen Einsicht. Und eine Kraftquelle (für
 alle Kinder) deines (Erbarmens 14) hast du aufgedeckt) . . .¹⁾

And I, gifted with understanding,
 I have known Thee, O my God,
 because of the Spirit (12) that Thou hast put in me;
 and I have heard what is certain according to Thy marvellous
 secret because of Thy holy Spirit.
 (13) Thou hast [o]pened Knowledge in the midst of me
 concerning the Mystery of Thine understanding,
 and the source of [Thy] powe [r and the fountain of] Thy
 [goodness] (14) [Thou hast revealed (to me)] . . .²⁾

If these men succeed in conveying the real meaning of the Heb. text, this passage is a direct parallel to Jn 4: 10 ff. and 7: 38 ff. Even the terminology is very similar. Note that the spirit is "in me" (בִּי)³⁾ and that it is "given" (נָתַן)⁴⁾ by God. The combination ב and נָתַן with respect to the spirit occurs in the O. T. only in Ezek 37: 14; and only Ezek uses ב for "within" (2: 2; 3: 24; 10: 17). But נָתַן of the spirit is used with some other term meaning "within" or "upon" in Ezek 11: 19; 36: 26 f.; Neh 9: 20; Is 42: 1. Elsewhere the spirit is spoken of as being "poured,"⁵⁾ a different word for "pour" being used each time except in the first two passages: Ezek 39: 29; Joel 2: 28 f.; Is 32: 15; 44: 3; Prov 1: 23. In the N. T. the equivalent combination of ἐν and δίδωμι with respect to the spirit occurs only in Jn 14: 16 f.;⁶⁾ and δίδωμι with respect to the spirit is a regular part of Jn's vocabulary (cf. 3: 34; 7: 39⁷⁾; 14: 16 f.; 1 Jn 3: 24; 4: 13). However, δίδωμι with respect to the spirit occurs in the N. T. also in Lk 11: 13; Acts 8: 18; 15: 8; Rom 5: 5;

¹⁾ H. Bardtke, „Die Loblieder von Qumran V,“ *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 5 (1957), col. 339. Cf. also Gaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 182 f.

²⁾ A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. by G. Vermes (Trans. copyright by Basil Blackwell, 1961), p. 240.

³⁾ For the idea of the spirit "within" or "upon" one in the O. T. and Scrolls cf. Is 11: 2; 26: 9; 44: 3; 59: 21; 61: 1; 63: 10 f.; Job 32: 18; Ezek 2: 2; 3: 24; 10: 17; 11: 5, 19; 36: 26 f.; 37: 14; Zech 12: 1, 10; 1QH 7: 6 f.; 17: 25 f.; 1QS 4: 26.

⁴⁾ So also in 1QH 13: 19; 16: 11; 17: 17; Fragment 3: 14; cf. 1QH 9: 12 f.

⁵⁾ Cf. 1QH 17: 25 f.; Fragment 2: 9.

⁶⁾ Cf. 1 Thess 4: 8 where Paul quotes Ezek 37: 14 from the LXX where δίδωμι and εἰς occur together.

⁷⁾ The textual variant δεδομένον may be original here.

2 Cor 1: 22; 5: 5; 1 Thess 4: 8; but the usage in Jn is almost as frequent as in the rest of the N. T. In the N. T. the spirit was thought of as "filling"¹⁾ or dwelling "in" or "upon" the believer (after Jesus' "glorification" in each case except Lk 11: 13²⁾); cf. Mt 10: 20; Acts 2: 4, 17 f.; 4: 8; 6: 5; especially 19: 2, and many others; Rom 5: 5; 8: 9, 11; 1 Cor 3: 16; 6: 19; 2 Cor 1: 22; 2 Tim 1: 14; Tit 3: 5; Heb 2: 4; 6: 4; Jude 19 f. Jn certainly shares the original N. T. conception of the spirit, which goes back to the O. T. and Qumran community.

In connection with the gospel idea of the descent of the holy spirit upon Jesus at the baptism, Jn's idea of Jesus and/or the Father giving the holy spirit to believers after Jesus' glorification, and the later N. T. concept of the believers' actual reception and possession of the holy spirit, it is important to note certain additional ideas of the Qumran community. That community looked eschatologically for an institution of the holy spirit (1QS 9: 3). Moreover, the terms רוח or mostly קודש were used of God's spirit (1QS 4: 20 f.; 8: 16; CD 2: 12 (2: 10); 1QH 9: 32; 14: 13; 16: 2 f., 6 f.) and of the spirit in man (CD 3: 3 (4: 2); 5: 11 (7: 12); 7: 4 (8: 20); 1QS 3: 7; 1QH 1: 15); cf. also 1QH 4: 31; 14: 13; 15: 13; especially 16: 6-14 where it is hard to distinguish between usages. I call special attention to only one more passage from the Scrolls which may have influenced the thought of Jn 4: 10 ff. and 7: 38, that is, 1QH 8: 16 f.: "And you, my God, have put in my mouth as an early rain, rain for all ['thirsty ones'] and a spring of living waters that shall not fail to the opening up of heaven." This is obviously a free quotation or allusion to Is 58: 11, one of the sources usually suggested for the quotation in Jn 7: 38. Note that the "living water" of Jn 7: 38 is closer to 1QH 8: 16 f. than to Is 58: 11 and that Jn 4: 10 ff. is much closer to the 1QH passage than to Is 58: 11. All in all Jn's statements of 4: 10 ff. and 7: 38 are more closely parallel to 1QH 8: 16 f. than to Is 58: 11. Cf. here also 1QH 8: 7.

Having presented the evidence for the study of the quotation in Jn 7: 38, let us attempt to formulate some general conclusions. There seem to be several possible solutions to the problems. Yet each suggested solution must remain only a partial one because there is not sufficient evidence to determine the one final solution.

In the first place, the thought and language of Jn may show influence

¹⁾ In the O. T. "fill" is used with the spirit in Ex 31: 3; 35: 31; cf. 28: 3.

²⁾ Each of the Synoptists thought of Jesus himself as possessing the spirit: Mk 1: 8, 10; Mt 3: 11, 16; 12: 18; Lk 1: 15; 3: 16, 22; 4: 1, 18; cf. Acts 10: 38.

³⁾ Restoration by Bardtke.

from the wisdom literature of the O. T. It is evident from the examples showing the use of *κοιλία* in the LXX to translate some Heb. word meaning "within" as the seat of the emotions that this usage is far more frequent in Job, Pss, and Prov than anywhere else in the O. T. The use of *κοιλία* in Jn probably comes closest to its usage in those O. T. books; and this usage in both Heb. and Gr. is most frequent in those books. See here also the evidence given for the use of *πηγή ζωῆς*, with the corresponding Heb., which is used extensively only in Prov. Perhaps the key passage from the wisdom literature is the LXX text of Prov 18: 4. Here the use of the word *κοιλία* does not occur, but the LXX changes דברי פִּי־אִישׁ to λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ which is equivalent to the use of *κοιλία*. With this note also the ἀναπηδύει . . . πηγῇ ζωῆς¹⁾; and cf. the ἐν αὐτῷ πηγῇ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον of Jn 4: 14, and IQH 12: 11 f. Furthermore, the combination of the words ὕδωρ . . . ποταμός . . . ζωῆς occurs nowhere else in the Heb. or Gr. O. T. This is the same combination of words as in Jn 7: 38 except that in Jn the last word occurs in the participle form ζῶντος. The same combination occurs exactly in Rev 22: 1 but nowhere else in the N. T.

Another factor from the O. T. and Jewish tradition which may have influenced the thought of Jn is the Mosaic miracles of manna and water. At several places in the O. T. the two desert miracles of manna from heaven and water from the rock were singled out and combined. Cf. Dt 8: 15 f.; Pss 78: 15-30; 105: 40 f.; also Is 48: 21; Ps 114: 8. The Jews expected a repetition of those miracles in the messianic age.²⁾ Familiar with the Jewish expectation, Jn probably had in mind the combination of the miracles of manna and water when constructing the framework of his gospel. In chapter six Jn had already presented Jesus as "the true bread from heaven" which gives "life to the world" and "the bread of life." In contrast to the fathers who "ate the manna in the wilderness and died," Jesus is "the living bread," and "if anyone eat of this bread, he shall live forever." Cf. 6: 58: "This is the bread which came down out of heaven, not as the fathers ate and died; the one who eats this bread shall live forever." In chapter six Jn may have been thinking of Jesus as the repetition of the original miracle of manna,³⁾ only in a more

¹⁾ Here Sym., Th. read πηγῇ σοφίας and Aq. φλὲς σοφίας with MT.

²⁾ See here J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (1955), pp. 154 ff. and the bibliography and references given in his notes; Burney, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-111; Str.-B., 2, pp. 481 f.

³⁾ The only other explicit references to manna in the N. T. are in Rev 2: 17 and Heb 9: 4. Cf. "The Gospel of the Ebionites" (in Epiphanius, *Against Heresies*

effective way. In chapters four and seven he may have been thinking of its counterpart in Jesus as the true water miracle. Cf. here 1 Cor 10: 4.

It is interesting to note in this connection that at only one place in the O. T., in so far as I have been able to determine, are manna, water, and spirit mentioned together—Neh 9: 20: "Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them, and withheldest not thy manna from their mouth, and gavest them water for their thirst." Jn could have had the trio of this passage in mind during the creative, artistic composition of his gospel.

The fact still remains, however, that the exact source or sources of the quotation and the text used must thus far remain unknown. There is no single O. T. passage or combination of passages which satisfies the statement of Jn. According to the evidence from the O. T. and the Qumran Scrolls with regard to the inside of a man as the seat of the emotions, the spirit also being within, the use of water interpreted symbolically of the Torah and the spirit, and the expectation of the repetition of the miracles of manna and water in the messianic age, it is evident that Jn has Hebrew tradition solidly behind him. It appears not impossible, nor even unlikely, that there actually existed a quotation like the one given in Jn 7: 38. If such a quotation was known to him, it is, nevertheless, not known to us.

It appears more likely that Jn was motivated by a combination of several passages and then from memory wrote down a quotation to support his theology. Because of the thought and the language employed, the most likely sources are Is 44: 3; the thought and language of several passages in Ezek, such as 37: 14; 47: 1-12; Prov 18: 4 (LXX); Neh 9: 20; and others suggested in the preceding pages.

The argument of commentators that the singular ἡ γράφη rather than the plural αἱ γραφαί indicates that the author had in mind a single O. T. passage instead of a combination of passages carries little weight in view of Jn's varying style and literary method. Jn never uses αἱ γραφαί to introduce a quotation; but cf. 5: 39. And he uses the singular ἡ γράφη in various ways; cf. its use in 2: 22; 10: 35; 13: 18; 17: 12; 19: 24, 28, 36, 37; and 20: 9 and comments on the next quotation (7: 42).

In this quotation Jn simply adapts in a creative fashion his broad knowledge of the O. T. scriptures and Jewish tradition to suit his Christian theology. We have seen that there was in the O. T. a certain school of thought with respect to the spirit which was continued by the Qumran

30: 13: 4); text given in Albert Huck, *A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*, 9th ed., ed. by Hans Lietzmann and Frank L. Cross (1936), p. 10.

community and apparently followed by Jn. According to this school of thought the usual thing was for God to pour out the spirit on the prophets, the servant, the messiah, or other special persons, and they in turn would pour it out upon their followers.

If the spirit was thought of as dwelling "within" a man, it would be natural to think of it symbolically as flowing "from within"; and the Hebrew conception might also naturally be conveyed with ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας.¹⁾

Jn reproduces the ideas of the O. T. and Qumran Scrolls completely, but he adds several distinctly creative and original Christian elements. Now Jesus is the prophet who has come or the messiah (both titles are applied to Jesus in Jn), and he possesses the spirit within him. After his "glorification," he and/or the Father will give (or send—cf. 14: 16 and 14: 26, e.g.) the spirit to Christian believers.

Finally, whereas in the Jewish tradition water was interpreted symbolically mostly of the Torah, sometimes of the spirit, Jn interprets it symbolically of the spirit. Perhaps Jn intentionally changes the symbolism here from the Torah to the spirit. The experience of the spirit would now take the place of the Torah in the lives of Christian believers. However, as we have seen, Jn has good precedent behind him, both in the O. T. and in the Qumran Scrolls, for the association of water and the spirit, so that no change was really necessary. At any rate, for Jn the spirit, not the Torah, was the all-important thing. The believer who has drunk from the living water of the spirit which Jesus gives (or which he and/or the Father will give—the thought of Jn with respect to the spirit is not consistent, so we cannot be consistent in attempting to present his thought) will himself become a source from whom the living water of the spirit flows for the benefit of others. This is the interpretation given to the Johannine passage by several early Christian writers, especially Origen.²⁾ It also coincides with the thought and language of Jn himself in 4: 10 ff.; 14: 16 f.; and 20: 22.

¹⁾ It is interesting to note here the terms used in two well known Hebrew translations of the N.T., the one by Ginsburg (Salkinson-Ginsburg's Hebrew New Testament, 1886), the other by Delitzsch (London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1937). The former translates ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας with מִקְרִיבוֹ, the latter with מִבְּטֶנוֹ.

²⁾ Cf. fragment from his *Comm. on John* (text printed in A. E. Brooke, *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel* (1896), 2, p. 250); *Hom. on Num.* 17: 4 (text in *Origenis Opera Omnia quae Graece vel Latine tantum exstant* (1733). Cf. also Cyprian, *Ep.* 63: 8. Since the writing of this chapter, I have read the short study on John 7: 37-39 by J. Blenkinsopp and am pleased to discover that we have reached the same conclusions independently. He gives additional references to Origen ("John vii. 37-39: Another Note on A Notorious Crux," *NTS* 6 (1959), pp. 95-98).

CHAPTER SIX

THE SEED OF DAVID

Jn 7:42

Texts

Jn 7: 42

οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ
σπέρματος Δαυίδ, καὶ
ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ τῆς κώμης
ὅπου ἦν Δαυίδ, ἔρχεται ὁ
χριστός;

Mt 2: 6

καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα.
ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος
ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

Lk 2: 4

εἰς πόλιν Δαυίδ ἥτις καλεῖται Βηθλέεμ,
διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς
Δαυίδ

Rom 1: 3

περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ
γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος
Δαυίδ κατὰ σάρκα

Lk 2: 11

ὅς ἐστιν χριστὸς κύριος, ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ.

Mic 5: 1 (LXX B)

καὶ σύ, Βηθλέεμ οἶκος Ἐφράθα,
ὀλιγοστὸς εἰ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν
Ἰούδα· ἐξ οὗ μοι ἐξελεύσεται
τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

Mic 5: 1 (MT)

ואתה בית-לחם אפרתה
צעיר להיות באלפי
יהודה ממך לי יצא
להיות מושל בישראל

Mic 5: 1 (Targ. Jon.)

מנך קדמי יפוק משיחא למהוי
עביד שולטן על ישראל

2 Sam 5: 2 (LXX B)

σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ

2 Sam 5: 2 (MT)

אתה תרעה את-עמי את-ישראל

2 Sam 7: 12 (LXX B)

καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ

2 Sam 7: 12 (MT)

והקימתי את-זרעך אחריך

Ps 89: 4 f. (LXX B)

ῥάμωσα Δαυεὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου

Ps 89: 4 f. (MT)

ושבעתי לדוד עבדי

ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου

עד-עולם אכזר ורעך

Ps 89: 36 f. (LXX B)

εἰ τῷ Δαυεὶδ ψεύσομαι·
τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μενεῖ

Ps 89: 36 f. (MT)

אם-לדוד אכזב
זרעו לעולם יהיה

1 Sam 20: 6 (LXX B)

Δαυεὶδ δραμεῖν ἕως εἰς Βηθλέεμ τήν
πόλιν αὐτοῦ

1 Sam 20: 6 (MT)

דוד לרוץ בית-לחם עירו

Ps 18: 51 (LXX B)

καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος τῷ χριστῷ αὐτοῦ,
τῷ Δαυεὶδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ.

Ps 18: 51 (MT)

ועשה חסד למשיחו
לדוד ולזרעו

Jer 23: 5 (LXX B)

καὶ ἀναστήσω τῷ Δαυεὶδ ἀνατολήν
δικαίαν

Jer 23: 5 (MT)

והקמתי לדוד צמח
צדיק

Jer 33: 22 (LXX B)

Lacking

Jer 33: 22 (MT)

כן ארבה את-זרע דוד עבדי

1 Kgs 11: 39 (LXX B)

Lacking; καὶ κακουχήσω τὸ σπέρμα
δαυὶδ (Iσλ. A)AOL

1 Kgs 11: 39 (MT)

ואענה את-זרע דוד

Is 11: 1 (LXX B)

καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης
'Ιεσσαί, καὶ ἄνθος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης ἀναβήσεται.

Is 11: 1 (MT)

ויצא חטר מנוע
יש' ונצר משרשיו יפירה

Is 11: 1 (Targ. Jon.)

ויפוק מלכא מבנוהי דישי
ומשיחא מבני בנוהי יתרבי

Like those in 6: 31 and 12: 13, this quotation occurs on the lips of some of the multitude who hear Jesus. The multitude questions his descent and place of his birth. This quotation is found nowhere else in the N. T., but one closely related to it is found in Mt 2: 5 f. The formula in the precise words οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν (ὅτι) occurs only here in the N. T., but cf. καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή in Jn 7: 38 and καὶ πάλιν ἐτέρα

γραφὴ λέγει in 19: 37. ἡ γραφὴ λέγει is found as a formula in the declarative or interrogative form in Rom 4: 3; 9: 17; 10: 11; 11: 2; Gal 4: 30; 1 Tim 5: 18; Ja 4: 5. "Scripture said" is used as a formula in Rabbinic literature to introduce a quotation from the O. T.¹⁾

As in the previous quotation, the first difficulty is that of finding the exact O. T. source or sources from which it comes. In addition to the texts listed, only some of which are usually suggested as sources, the following may also have influenced the thought and language of Jn: Ezek 37: 24 f.; 1 Sam 17: 15; 20: 6, 28; Ps 132: 10 f., 17; 89: 3 f., 20, 35 f., 49-51; Mt 2: 1, 4. No one passage or combination of passages from the O. T. fully satisfies the words of Jn. In the first place, the phrase τὸ σπέρμα δαυίδ does not occur in the LXX AB (B lacks the three following passages), and the Heb. equivalent זרע דוד occurs only in 1 Kgs 11: 39 and Jer 33: 22, 26. In 1 Kgs 11: 39 LXX A reads σπέρμα Ἰσλ.; Origen and Lucian, σπέρμα δαυίδ. Jer 33: 22, 26 does not occur in LXX AB. The first of those passages is clearly not messianic, nor is the second, strictly speaking, but it does belong to those passages expressing the future hope²⁾ of Israel and follows after the messianic passage of the "branch of righteousness" in Jer 33: 14-18. Here Jn may also have been influenced by such passages as 2 Sam 7: 12; 22: 51 = Ps 18: 51; Ps 89: 4 f., 36 f.³⁾

It is equally difficult to determine the O. T. source for the rest of the quotation: "from Bethlehem the village where David was, comes the Christ." The source universally given is Mic 5: 1, which is the most likely one in the O. T. except possibly 1 Sam 17: 15 and 20: 6, 28. Of those the terminology of Jn is closer to 1 Sam 20: 6 than to any other O. T. passage. 1 Sam 17: 15 is lacking in LXX B, is inserted in Origen and Lucian, and is probably inserted also in LXX A.⁴⁾

The use of ὁ χριστός in Jn shows affinity to the Targum of several O. T. passages in that the word משיח occurs there whereas in the MT and LXX it does not. It occurs in the Targum Jon. of Mic 5: 1. The word משיח is inserted after the word "David" in the Targum of Jer 23: 5 and 33: 15: לידוד משיח. In Ps 18: 51 it is inserted before "David". A passage of some importance may be the Targum of Is 11: 1 because the spirit of the Lord is mentioned with the "messiah."⁵⁾ The spirit has also

1) Cf. Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes* (1948), p. 200.

2) Cf. S. Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* (1955), p. 147.

3) Targum reads "his sons" for "his seed."

4) See H. P. Smith, *The Books of Samuel*, ICC (1929), p. 155.

5) The Targum sometimes gives passages a messianic import; cf., e.g., Is 10: 27.

been mentioned in the larger context of our quotation in Jn. ¹⁾ On the other hand, the term "messiah" occurs in both the MT and LXX in the Davidic passages of Ps 118: 51 = 2 Sam 22: 51 and 132: 10 f.; cf. also Ps 89: 49, 51.

Modern commentators are of little real help for a study of Jn 7: 42. Those considered are unanimous in giving Mic 5: 1 as the source for "from Bethlehem," but they are not unanimous in their selection of sources for "from the seed of David." Those who suggest problems of translation from Aramaic behind many of the quotations in Jn say almost nothing about Jn 7: 42. Burney, ²⁾ for example, says only that the quotation is based on Is 11: 1 and Jer 23: 5, etc. (Davidic descent) and Mic 5: 1 (from Bethlehem) and that the references are general merely. To the best of my knowledge Torrey ³⁾ does not deal with Jn 7: 42. Barrett ⁴⁾ lists this quotation among the group which are not exact quotations but adaptations which might be based on either the Heb. or Gr. text. He says that the scripture referred to for the messiah's birth is Mic 5: 1 and that its use seems to be Christian since it is not quoted in Rabbinic literature for the origin of the messiah until late. With respect to the first part he merely says that several passages declare that the messiah will be of the seed of David, e.g., Ps 89: 4 f. ⁵⁾ Bultmann ⁶⁾ says that the evangelist's style shows the characteristic peculiarities of the Jewish manner of speaking, such as the question οὐχ ἡ γράφη εἶπεν, use of σπέρμα for the meaning "descendants," and ὁ χρ. ἐρχ. The words ἀπὸ Βηθ. τῆς κώμης, etc. are good Greek. He also says that according to 2 Sam 7: 12 f.; Is 11: 1; Jer 23: 5 a Davidic messiah is expected and that according to Mic 5: 1 he must be born in Bethlehem. Bousset ⁷⁾ states that in Maccabaeian times, with few exceptions, the messiah was expected from the house of David. Among the passages he cites as evidence from the Pseudepigrapha, O. T., Rabbinic literature, and the N. T. are the Targum Jon. to Is 11: 1; Jer 23: 5; 33: 15; Hos 3: 5. Then he adds: „Dass die Geburtsstätte des Messias gerade Bethlehem sein sollte, scheint doch nur eine vereinzelte Ueberlieferung gewesen zu sein." He lists only Mt 2: 5; Jn 7: 41 f.; and Targ. Jon. to Mic 5: 1. Str.-B. have nothing to add for Mt 2: 5 f. or Jn 7: 42.

¹⁾ Jn 7: 39; cf. comments on the previous quotation.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 118.

³⁾ For his discussion of Mt 2: 6 cf. *Documents of the Primitive Church*, pp. 49-51 and Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-101.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

⁶⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 230 f.

⁷⁾ *Die religion des Judentums* (1926), pp. 226 f.

The context of Jn 7: 42 is also of little help in determining its source. The immediate context is really a continuation of the whole section of vss. 37-44, discussed in the last chapter. A division arises in the group because some had said that Jesus was the Christ. During the course of the conversation, several points of view with respect to the origin of the Christ unfold themselves in typical Johannine fashion. First, there is probably the view of those Jews who had come to know Jesus of Nazareth and who said, "Does the Christ come out of Galilee?" Jn says nothing elsewhere about the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem but seems to understand that his home at least, if not the place of his birth, was in Nazareth of Galilee.¹⁾ This is a phase of the Christian belief about Jesus which Jn shares with, or borrows from, the Synoptists.²⁾ But Jn nowhere states the place of Jesus' birth. Apparently he is simply not interested in the actual place of Jesus' birth, nor even in his Davidic descent.³⁾ The second point of view is that the messiah is to come from "the seed of David," a fixed part of Jewish messianic belief since the time of the prophets.⁴⁾ Yet even this well known Jewish belief, shared, of course, by the Christians, is put in specifically Christian terms. In the third place, there is the view that the messiah was to be born at Bethlehem, and it is expressed in the second half of our quotation: "from Bethlehem, the village where David was." This view with respect to the origin of the messiah I shall call the uniquely Christian viewpoint.⁵⁾

The last two views are expressed as a quotation introduced with the formula οὐχ ἡ γράφη εἶπεν. The quotation is clearly a compound quotation composed of two separate parts joined by the copulative καί. No single O. T. passage can satisfy the quotation as it now stands. In the following pages I shall have more to say about these two views and the sources for them.

To the best of my knowledge there is no passage in the Qumran Scrolls which is of specific value for our study of Jn 7: 42. Several things of

¹⁾ Jn 1: 45 f.; 7: 52; 18: 5, 7; cf. also 4: 43 ff.; 7: 9 f.

²⁾ Cf., e.g., Mk 1: 9; 10: 47; Mt 3: 13; 21: 11; Lk 4: 16.

³⁾ Contrast the view that no one knows whence the messiah comes (7: 27). This is a typically Rabbinic point of view known to Jn, and perhaps even shared by him, and for that reason he does not take sides in the discussion in our context. See here Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, pp. 295-308; Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 f.; Str.-B., 2, pp. 488 f.

⁴⁾ See Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, pp. 159 ff.; Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (1955); Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 90 f.; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 2 (1932), pp. 323 ff.

⁵⁾ By "uniquely Christian" I mean that the view differs from the usual Jewish (Christian) point of view. The evidence is presented below.

a general nature with respect to the Scrolls and the use of this quotation in Mt and Jn are discussed on the following pages.

In Mt 2: 6 we find the combination of Mic 5: 1, 3 and 2 Sam 5: 2 as a composite quotation introduced by the formula, "for thus it is written through the prophet." The text of Mt agrees with neither the MT nor the LXX.¹ The MT and LXX are closer to each other than Mt is to either. Yet it is obvious that the O. T. sources are Mic 5: 1, 3 and 2 Sam 5: 2. The changes in the text of Mt²) are all to be explained as intentional alterations to strengthen his purpose for including the quotation in the first place—to confirm the Christian tradition that Jesus was from the line of David and was born at Bethlehem³)—by means of showing the fulfillment of an O. T. prophecy.

Even though the words of the quotation in Mt are put into the mouths of the scribes and chief priests, in accordance with Rabbinic custom, there is no evidence for saying that the text of Micah "belonged to Jewish sayings of messianic interpretation."⁴) This is true in spite of the fact that משיחא is inserted into the passage in the Targum.

It seems appropriate now to make a few observations about the method of Mt in using a quotation like the one under consideration and the method of the sect of Qumran. This is important for us because the method of Jn in this case, as in some others, is exactly the same. In the first place, the practice of combining two or more texts from the O. T. into a single composite or conflated quotation or allusion is one found frequently in the Scrolls.⁵) In the second place, the sect of Qumran sometimes inserted the word "messiah" into an O. T. passage so as to make it refer specifically to the messiah where originally there was no reference to the messiah in the strict sense of the term.⁶) Cf., for example, "branch

¹) On this point cf. Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 99 ff. and Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, pp. 49-51. ²) Cf. Stendahl, *Ibid.*

³) Cf. Mt 2: 1, 8; Lk 2: 4, 15.

⁴) Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

⁵) Cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, "Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline," in *Studia Theologica*, IX, Fasc. I (1955), pp. 40-66, esp. the list of passages on pp. 41 f.; J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956), pp. 138 f.; J. A. Fitzmyer, "4Q Testimonies and the New Testament" in *Theological Studies*, 18 (1957), pp. 513-537; M. Black, "Theological Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok*, 18-19 (1953-1954), pp. 72-97.

⁶) Here I mean to distinguish between the usual O. T. conception of messianism and the use of the term "messiah." In the big majority of messianic passages in the O. T. the technical term is not attached to the concept. Possible exceptions are in Pss such as 132: 10 f., e.g., but the interpretation is disputed (See H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1946), pp. 25 f.). In N. T. times, however, the term was used to convey the concept.

of righteousness" (צִמְח צִדְקָה, Jer 33: 15; cf. also 23: 5) and "messiah of righteousness" (מְשִׁיחַ הַצִּדְקָה, "4Q Patriarchal Blessings" ¹⁾). This is a process very frequent in the Targums.²⁾ In the third place, the Qumran sect quoted and interpreted passages of O. T. scripture in such a way as to support the particular point of view and purpose of the writer.³⁾

It is evident that the method of Mt is the same as that of the sect of Qumran: he conflates two O. T. passages into one, inserts the word "messiah" (in the context here (2: 4), and changes the passages cited to suit his theological purpose—to confirm the Christian tradition that Jesus the messiah was born at Bethlehem—by the use of a proof text from the O. T.

Mic 5: 1 properly belongs to that largest group of O. T. messianic passages dealing with the coming of an exceptional king who would be a "scion of David, 'a shoot from the stump of Jesse,' descended from the ancient Bethlehemite line." ⁴⁾ But the idea of a messianic ruler descended from the Bethlehemite line is not the same as the belief that "the messiah" would be born at Bethlehem. I doubt that the Mic passage means more than that the future "ruler" would come from the line of Bethlehem, that is, David. It is hardly meant to mean that Bethlehem would be the place of messiah's birth.⁵⁾ This would account for the fact that Mic 5: 1 was unimportant in Jewish messianism; it added nothing new to the Davidic concepts so strongly expressed in the more popular books of Is, Jer, Zech, and Ruth.⁶⁾

At no place in Jewish messianism is it stated exactly where or when the messiah will come. Certain signs may indicate that the time of the

¹⁾ See J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature" in *JBL*, 75 (1956), p. 175. The passage here is almost certainly an allusion to Jer 33: 15; it is much closer to Jer 23: 5 and esp. 33: 15 than to the one Allegro discusses on p. 176 where he refers the reader to those passages. On this subject see J. V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of God as messianic Titles in the complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll" in *VT*, 5 (1955), pp. 366-372.

²⁾ Cf. examples given above and Is 43: 10; 52: 13; 53: 10 where in each case the word "messiah" is inserted into the translation.

³⁾ See W. H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *BA*, 14 (1951), pp. 54-76; Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 134-140; Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-202; P. Wernberg-Møller, *op. cit.*

⁴⁾ S. Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

⁵⁾ So Klausner: "It is obvious that here is indicated only a king from the royal line of the house of David, which originated in Bethlehem, and there is no need to suppose that this king himself is to be born in Bethlehem" (*op. cit.*, p. 77). Cf. also J. M. P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Micah*, ICC (1911), p. 103.

⁶⁾ E. g., Is 9: 7; 11: 1, 10; Jer 23: 5; 33: 17; Zech 3: 8; 6: 12 f.

coming is either near or far off. And pious men might even pray for the messiah to come soon, but in the last analysis the exact time and place of his coming are known only to God. This is the view of the apocryphal literature of the O. T. and Rabbinic Judaism.¹⁾ This is the Jewish-Rabbinic view presented in Jn 7: 26 f.: "Can it be that the rulers indeed know that this is the Christ? Howbeit we know this man whence he is; but when the Christ comes, no one knows whence he is."

Mt 2: 6 becomes a clear case of an independent Jewish-Christian interpretation of an O. T. text, independent even of any previous strictly Jewish interpretation. Mt 2: 2—"Where is he that is born *king* of the Jews?"—reflects the characteristic Jewish expectation of an ideal king. In 2: 4 the insertion of the word "messiah" makes the verse the transitional point from the characteristically Jewish to the uniquely Christian point of view. The expected "king" of O. T. messianism has now become "the messiah" in the fullest sense of the word, and to this idea is added the Christian tradition of his birth at Bethlehem. The point is confirmed in typically Matthaean style by a proof text from the O. T. in 2: 5 f.

Coming to Jn we can see at once that his method of quoting in this case is similar to that of the Scrolls and Mt. He combines, but does not conflate, two passages and joins them together with *καί*.²⁾ Whereas Mt inserts the word "messiah" only in the context, Jn inserts the word into what he must mean to be part of the actual quotation. Finally, like the Scrolls and Mt, he adapts the resultant quotation to his particular point of view, in this case to conform to the Christian tradition of the Christ's birth at Bethlehem.

But what about the content of Jn's quotation? We have said that the expression "the seed of David" does not occur in the LXX AB nor, to the best of my knowledge, in the Scrolls, and that the Heb. equivalent is found only in 1 Kgs 11: 39 and Jer 33: 22, 26. It is not inconceivable that Jn had in mind the Heb. text of one of those passages.

It may be important to note that one expression of the O. T. and the Scrolls with respect to David and his offspring in passages which may be interpreted as messianic is "to David and to his seed" (לדוד ולורעו) τῷ Δαυιδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ³⁾. And the usual O. T. terms with refer-

¹⁾ Cf., e.g., 2 Bar 27: 1-15; 29: 3; 30: 1; 2 Esd 7: 27 f.; Mowinkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 295-298; Str.-B., 2, pp. 488 f.; C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

²⁾ Contrast his style and method of combining two quotations in 12: 38 ff. and 19: 36 f.

³⁾ So in 2 Sam 22: 51 = Ps 18: 51; 1 Kgs 2: 33; cf. "4Q Patriarchal Blessings," *JBL*, 75 (1956), p. 175.

ence to a messianic descendant of David are "shoot" (צמח, Jer 23: 5; 33: 15; cf. also Zech 3: 8; 6: 12), "rod" and "stem" (גזע, חטר, Is 11: 1), "root" (שרש, Is 11: 10). So also in the Scrolls¹⁾ and N. T.²⁾ It is conceivable that "the seed of David" in Jn is a free, creative adaptation or citation from memory, of either Heb. or Gr. text, of one or the other of such passages as Is 11: 1 f.,³⁾ 10; Jer 23: 5; 33: 15; 2 Sam 7: 12; especially 2 Sam 22: 51 = Ps 18: 51; Ps 89: 3 f., 29, 35 f.; 132: 10 f.⁴⁾; 1 Kgs 2: 33.

Considering the second part of the compound quotation as "from Bethlehem the village where David was," we find the possible O. T. sources much more limited than for the first part. I can point only to Mic 5: 1 and 1 Sam 20: 6. It is again conceivable that Jn had in mind either one of these passages, the latter being the more likely. It is impossible to tell, however, whether he used the Heb. or Gr. text.

Mt 2: 6 is clearly a quotation from two O. T. sources which, in spite of the differences in Mt, are obvious. In Jn, however, the O. T. sources for the quotation are by no means obvious, and there is no one passage or combination of passages which satisfies the quotation. For the following reasons, therefore, for Jn the sources are not the O. T. but the Synoptics Mt and Lk.

In the first place, the use of Mic 5: 1 as a proof text seems to have originated with the Christians. No Rabbinic passages cite Bethlehem as the place of the messiah's birth before the fourth century.⁵⁾ In spite of the fact that in Mt the reference to Jesus' birth at Bethlehem is put on the lips of the chief priests and scribes and in Jn on the lips of some of the Jewish critics of Jesus, it must not be assumed that the messiah's birth at Bethlehem was an established Jewish or Rabbinic doctrine in the first century. In the birth stories of Mt and Lk as a whole it is, of course, possible that the apologetic motive is to confirm the accepted belief that the messiah was to be born at Bethlehem. Passages like those we have discussed might give rise to such a belief. On the other hand, the motive here might just as possibly work in reverse. Jesus' actual

¹⁾ For references cf. *JBL*, 75(1956), pp. 175-181; Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 148-154.

²⁾ Cf. Rom 15: 12; Rev 5: 5; 22: 16.

³⁾ Jn may have thought of Is 11: 1 f. since the spirit is to rest upon the "shoot" of Jesse and since Jn has just dealt with the spirit flowing from Jesus and the believer immediately before our quotation. This would give an artistic blending of material characteristic of the style and method of Jn.

⁴⁾ Note "of the fruit of thy body" in Ps 132: 11 and cf. Acts 2: 30.

⁵⁾ See Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 90 and Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

birth at Bethlehem motivated the Christians' search for a prophecy to confirm it. Mt found it in Mic 5: 1, and the author of Jn learned about it from the Synoptics. The view presented appears to be a specifically Christian view.

The messianic views of Jn before and after this point in the gospel are all typically Jewish. The coming of a prophet is associated with the messianic expectation (1: 21, 25; 6: 14; 7: 40); the time and place of the messiah's coming are not known (7: 27); he is a descendant of David (7: 42 a); the doing of signs is mentioned in connection with his coming (7: 31); the messiah is to abide forever (12: 34). Only in this quotation do we have any hint of the Christian belief in his birth at Bethlehem.

We call to mind the two views with respect to the origin of the Christ in our quotation: the view of those who assume that because they knew him from Galilee he was born there ¹⁾ and therefore reject him as messiah;²⁾ and the view of those who are aware of the Christian tradition of his birth at Bethlehem.³⁾ The actual view of Jn himself goes beyond either one presented here. Jn's conception of Jesus as "the Christ the son of God" (11: 27) surpassed the common Jewish-Christian concept of his Davidic descent and the Christian tradition of his birth at Bethlehem. The messiah of Jn is a more sublime figure. The physical descent of Jesus and the place of his birth are at most secondary compared to Jesus' real origin as the λόγος that was ἐν ἀρχῇ and σὰρξ ἐγένετο and even now is ἐκ τῶν ἄνω and not ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ⁴⁾. The presentation of two conflicting views may be only a device on Jn's part to portray the ignorance of Jesus' Jewish critics and even that of those Christians who fail to perceive the real meaning of Jesus. For this reason both views are left unanswered. A "division" arose among those who held the differing views, another device, it seems to me, to further emphasize their ignorance.⁵⁾ We have seen that, in spite of the strong belief in the Davidic lineage of the messiah in the O.T. and Scrolls, the expression "seed of David" does not occur in the LXX and Scrolls and only rarely in the Heb. O. T. The expression is rare also in the N. T. where it occurs only

¹⁾ This appears to be the view presented also in 1: 45 f.; 4: 43 f.; 7: 9; 18: 5, 7; cf. also Mk 1: 9; Mt 3: 13; 4: 13; 21: 11; 26: 69; 27: 55; Lk 1: 26; 2: 4, 39; Acts 2: 22; 10: 38.

²⁾ This coincides with the view of Jn 7: 27.

³⁾ Cf. Mt 2: 1, 5, 8, 16; Lk 2: 4, 11, 15.

⁴⁾ Jn 1: 1, 14; 8: 23.

⁵⁾ The "division" is a device effectively used also in 9: 16 and 10: 19 for the same reason.

here and in Rom 1:3 and 2 Tim 2:8.¹⁾ In the last passage the writer makes the phrase a part of Paul's gospel ("from the seed of David, according to my gospel"). In Rom 1:3 the phrase is a part of the "gospel of God" (vs. 1), "which he promised before through his prophets in the holy scriptures." According to the context in Rom, the phrase belonged to the earliest Christian belief about the messiah and served to indicate that he was born physically from the line of David.²⁾ According to the same context, Jesus became "the son of God. . . by the resurrection from the dead."

While the thought expressed by the phrase, "the seed of David," is in accord with the Jewish idea of a Davidic messiah, the terminology used to express that thought is of Christian origin. Jn may be indebted to Paul or at least to the same tradition as Paul.

In view of Jn's probable dependence on Lk 2:4, or the same tradition, as the most likely source for the second part of this quotation, it seems that here also Lk is Jn's most likely source. The phrase ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ is Jn's equivalent of the Lucan ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρὶᾶς Δαυὶδ, which occurs only in Lk 2:4 (cf. Lk 1:27). Jn may have invented a quotation or quoted from memory passages from both Paul and Lk.³⁾ But the phrase in Jn is typical of his own creative use of his Synoptic sources in general and in places where such usage has long been recognized.⁴⁾

For the second part of the quotation, ἀπὸ Βηθ. . . . Δαυίδ, the source could conceivably be an O. T. passage such as Mic 5:1 or more probably 1 Sam 20:6. It is not unlikely that ἀπὸ Βηθ. in Jn represents his interpretation of ἐκ σοῦ in the first line of Mt's second quotation, taking it to refer to Bethlehem in the first line of the first quotation. This reading may, however, be a free rendering from memory of the text of Mic 5:1: מִמָּצֵעַ, עֵצַי אוֹ (B) or ἐκ σοῦ (AQ). But again Lk 2:4, or the same tradition,

¹⁾ Contrast "seed of Abraham," which occurs in both Heb. and Gr. O. T. and in N. T.; cf. Is 41:8; Jer 33:26; 2 Chron 20:7; Ps 105:6; Jn 8:33, 37; Rom 9:7; 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22; Heb 2:16.

²⁾ Cf. Acts 2:30 and the birth stories and genealogies of Mt. and Lk.

³⁾ It is interesting to contrast with Jn's terminology Rev 5:5: ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ρίζα Δαυὶδ and 22:16: ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ρίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαυὶδ. These expressions are characteristically Jewish.

⁴⁾ The relation of Jn to the Synoptics is a subject which lies beyond the scope of this work, but cf. the commentaries and monographs listed in them; esp. P. Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (1938); *idem*, "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," *JTS* 4 (1953), pp. 31-35; H. Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker* (1926); C. H. Dodd, "Some Johannine 'Herrnworte' with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," *NTS* 2 (1955-56), pp. 75-86; S. Mendner, "Zum Problem 'Johannes und die Synoptiker,'" *NTS* 4 (1957-58), pp. 282-307.

is Jn's most probable source; the Johannine ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαυίδ is the equivalent of Lk's εἰς πόλιν Δαυίδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλέεμ. It is to be noted that the phrase "city of David" is found only in Lk 2: 4, 11 in the N. T. Moreover, while the phrase "city of David" does occur in both the Heb. and Gr. O. T., at no place is Bethlehem referred to in that way. In the O. T. the reference is always to the city of Jerusalem and more specifically to "the stronghold of Zion." ¹⁾ To the best of my knowledge, the word for "city" in the O. T. phrase in the LXX is always πόλις, never κώμη. Thus we have in Lk another example of distinctly Christian terminology which Jn uses in his own creative way. It must be understood that I am only proposing that the direct source for this part of the quotation is Lk 2: 4. The actual tradition for Jesus' birth at Bethlehem is better grounded in Mt than in Lk where the Nazareth tradition is the puzzling feature.

With respect to the last part of the quotation, ἔρχεται ὁ χριστός, the only likely O. T. source is one from the same tradition as the Targum Jon. of Mic 5: 1 or the Heb. or Gr. text of such a passage as Ps 118: 51. This possibility seems very remote. Perhaps Jn simply inserted the word "messiah," in keeping with the Jewish custom of the Scrolls and Targums of inserting the actual word into a messianic context. It seems more likely, however, that Jn was influenced by the use of the word χριστός in the context in which the quotation from Mic is set in Mt 2: 5 and that the Johannine ἔρχεται ὁ χριστός is the equivalent of Mt's (που) ὁ χριστὸς γεννᾶται.²⁾ Jn may also have been influenced by Lk 2: 11: ὃς ἐστὶν χριστὸς κύριος, ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ, especially since this is the only place where the word "Christ" is used with "the city of David."

Finally, in this quotation Jn shows acquaintance with two views with respect to the messiah, the one Jewish-Christian, the other distinctly Christian in the sense that it differs from the usual Jewish view. In the presentation of those views his method is the same as the method of the Qumran sect and Mt, but the terminology and contents are expressed in his own creative style and use of his sources, whether O. T. or Synoptic. Mt conflates two O. T. sources which are perfectly clear. Jn combines and compounds his material from Mt and Lk, or the same tradition, either with or without the use of the O. T.

The view that Bethlehem is the birth place of the messiah is so different that a division results. One wonders if those who held that view were persons who had read some of the writing of Mt and Lk in the school of

¹⁾ Cf., e.g., 2 Sam 5: 7, 9; 6: 10, 12, 16; 1 Kgs 8: 1; 11: 27.

²⁾ The order of words in P⁶⁶ (ο ἄρχεται) corresponds exactly with Mt's order.

St. John where the Synoptics were used for Christian instruction. Such persons may have been more familiar with the Synoptics than with the O. T., as early Christian writers frequently were. Jn neither refutes nor defends either view. His conception of Jesus as *the Christ* goes beyond either or both of them.

We come now to a crucial point in our argument. If the sources for the quotation in Jn 7:42 are Mt and Lk, or a tradition like the one recorded there, would Jn introduce such material as a quotation with the formula οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν? In view of the evidence which follows it becomes apparent that he might. Perhaps Jn was the first N. T. writer to refer to an earlier Christian writing as ἡ γραφή, thus giving it authority equal to O. T. scripture. Exactly what the term meant to him is not certain. It may have meant only a "writing" or written source which he read or used, perhaps still without a name.

Before proceeding to Jn and other N. T. writers, a brief survey of the usage of the word "scripture" and other formulas used to introduce quotations by early Christian writers considered while making this study will be enlightening. The examples given are taken only from a random scanning and are neither meant to be complete nor the best. Those writers nearest Jn's time were studied most carefully. We start with Cyprian and move backward to the time of Jn.

By the time of Cyprian (c. 200-258) both Mt and Jn are cited as "scripture" along with Is. Discussing baptism (*Ep.* 63:8), Cyprian maintains that the "scripture" of Jn 7:38 refers to baptism and not to the cup. "And that it might be more evident that the Lord is speaking there, not of the cup, but of baptism, the scripture (*Scriptura*) adds, saying: 'But this he spoke of the spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive.' " Here the comments of the writer of Jn 7:39 are clearly regarded as "scripture," as previously the words of Jesus were so regarded. Later in the same context Cyprian quotes Mt 5:6, having referred to the passage with the words, "when . . . the divine scripture speaks" (*cum . . . loquatur Scriptura divina*).

In Origen (c. 185-254) passages from both the O. T. and N. T. are quoted in the same context and introduced by the use of the word "scripture" or "scriptures." In *De Principiis* 1:1:1 quotations from Dt 4:24 and Jn 4:24 are referred to as "according to our scriptures" (*secundum scripturas nostras*). In 1:2:5, Col 1:15 and Heb 1:3 are cited, as from Paul, with reference to certain statements about Christ as the only-begotten son of God "supported by the authority of divine scriptures" (*divinae scripturae auctoritate muniantur*). In *Contra Celsum* Origen

also uses the word "scripture" or "scriptures" with reference to either the O. T. or N. T. or both in general. In this work Origen seems to cite passages mostly by specific book or gospel, etc., and he frequently quotes a passage without giving a source reference. In 2: 45, however, the comments of the author of Jn 21: 19 are quoted as "scripture" (ἡ γραφή); cf. also 2: 58; 2: 76; and 3: 8 (ἡ γραφή for O. T. in general).

In the conclusion to his treatise *On Christ and the Antichrist*, a work full of quotations and allusions from both O. and N. Testaments, Hippolytus (c. 170-236) says: "These things I put before you in a few words, my beloved brother Theophilus, having drawn them from holy scriptures (ἐξ ἁγίων γραφῶν). Hippolytus, like Origen, treats both O. and N. Testaments as "scripture," especially in his longest work, *Philosophumena*.

Clement of Alexandria (fl. c. 190-210), *Protrepticus* 1, quoted Tit 3: 4 f. with the formula, "the apostolic scripture says" (φησιν ἡ ἀποστολική γραφή). In 9 he says: "I might furnish a myriad scriptures (μυριάς . . . γραφάς) for you, of which not one tittle shall pass away" (Mt 5: 18). Later in the same chapter he cites Mt 18: 3 and Jn 3: 5 with the formula, "as the scripture says" (ὥς φησιν ἡ γραφή). "Scripture" may also refer to the O. T. In the *Paedagogus* 1: 3 Mt 15: 14 is alluded to with the formula, "as the scripture says" (καθὰ φησιν ἡ γραφή). Cf. also 1: 5 which quotes Mt 23: 37 as "scripture" (γραφή). Cf. *Stromata* 7: 14, 16.

In *Adv. Haer.* 2: 28: 3 Irenaeus (fl. c. 181-189) apparently uses *Scripturae* for the scriptures in general and *Scriptura* for a single passage. In 2: 27: 2 he includes the gospels in a list: *universae Scripturae, et Prophetiae, et Evangelia*. In 2: 30: 2 he definitely quotes Mt 7: 7 as "that which is written" (*illud quod scriptum est*). Cf. also 3: 5: 1. In *Haer.* 3 he frequently quotes from various books of the O. and N. Testaments without referring to them by name or as "scripture."

Theophilus (d. c. 180) uses ἡ γραφή for the O. T. in general in *To Autalytus* 2: 20 and others; so also ἡ ἁγία γραφή in 2: 13. In 2: 22 ἡ θεία γραφή refers to the O. T. in general or to a part of it (Gen) which deals with Adam; so other times. Later in 2: 22 αἱ ἅγιοι γραφαί include the gospel of Jn: "Whence the holy scriptures teach us and all the spirit-bearing men, from among whom John says . . ." (Jn 1: 1). In 3: 13 ὁ ἅγιος λόγος precedes a quotation from Prov 4: 25 and Mt 5: 28.

Justin Martyr (fl. c. 150-165) frequently quotes passages from both O. and N. Testaments and usually simply cites a passage without mentioning the name of the work from which it is taken and without a formula. Sometimes, however, he does mention the name of the work, e.g., "through Isaiah the prophet" (*Apol.* 1, 61: 6). He frequently quotes a saying of

Jesus from the Synoptics, e. g., *Apol.* 1, 63: 3 (Mt 11: 27) and occasionally from Jn, e. g., *Apol.* 1, 61: 4 (Jn 3: 3, 5) but does not refer to the quotation as γραφή. I have not found any use of γραφή in *Apol.* 1 to introduce a quotation from either the O. T. or N. T. In *Dial.* he uses the term γραφή of O. T. scripture in general, e. g., 57: 1, on the lips of Trypho; 57: 2, on the lips of Justin. γραφαί in 58: 1, on the lips of Justin, seem to mean specific examples of scripture. In *Dial.* 56 Justin uses γραφή several times with reference to a specific passage from the O. T. or to the O. T. in general. In the latter sense it is used interchangeably with αἱ γραφαί.

In 2 *Clement* (c. 150?) we find several interesting examples. He frequently quotes from books of both the O. and N. Testaments without naming the book quoted or referring to it as "scripture." In 2 he quotes Jesus' words, "I did not come to call righteous, but sinners" (Mk 2: 17) under the formula: καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφή λέγει (cf. Jn 19: 37). He quotes loosely from Ezek 14: 14 with the formula: λέγει δὲ καὶ ἡ γραφή ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιήλ (6) but from Gen 1: 27 (14) with only the formula: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (cf. Jn 7: 42). In 14 he says that if we "do not the will of the Lord, we shall be under the scripture which says (ἐσόμεθα ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς τῆς λεγούσης): 'My house became a den of robbers'" (Mk 11: 17 and par.). In 8 and 13 the words of Jesus have the same authority in the gospel as those of the Lord in the O. T.: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (Lk 16: 10-12) and λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος (alluding to Is 52: 5).

The writings of Ignatius (fl. c. 110-117) contain quotations and allusions from various N. T. books and a few from the O. T. Ignatius sometimes uses γέγραπται as a formula for introducing an O. T. quotation (e. g., *Eph.* 5; *Mag.* 12: 1), and sometimes he simply quotes or alludes to the O. T. passage without the use of a formula and without naming the book (e. g., *Mag.* 13; *Smyr.* 1: 1). I know of no place where he uses γραφή. His quotations and allusions to works of the N. T. seem to be made without the use of a formula and without the mention of the name of the work (e. g., 1 Thess 5: 17 in *Eph.* 10; Mt 12: 33 in *Eph.* 14; 1 Cor 15: 8 in *Rom* 9; Jn 3: 8 in *Phila.* 7). His references to the N. T. are almost always in the nature of allusions or short phrases, e. g., "bread of God" (Jn 6: 33) in *Eph.* 5; "pray unceasingly" (1 Thess 5: 17) in *Eph.* 10; cf. also *Eph.* 8; 20; *Mag.* 7; *Tral.* 5; *Rom.* 7.

The letter of Polycarp *To the Philipppians* (c. 125) contains many allusions and quotations from many N. T. books, though not referred to in any way as quotations. In 12: 1 he combines, but does not conflate, a quotation from Ps 4: 5 and one from Eph 4: 26, joins them together by *et*, and introduces the quotation with the formula, "as it is said in these

scriptures": *ut his scripturis dictum est . . . et . . .* — ὁμως, εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ταύτας ἐλέχθη . . . καὶ . . . ¹⁾

The writer of the *Ep. of Barnabas* (c. 150?) cites passages from various N. T. books but always without reference to the work cited and without a formula. Various formulae are used to cite O. T. passages, such as λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (from Ex in 4: 7; Is in 4: 11; Prov in 5: 4); γέγραπται (from Is in 5: 2); καὶ πάλιν λέγει ὁ προφήτης (Is in 6: 2; cf. λέγει κύριος ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ for Ps 18: 44 (9: 1) and ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι for 2 Esd 4: 33; 5: 5 (12: 1); cf. also 14: 7). In 6: 13 a citation from Mt 19: 30 or 20: 16 is introduced with λέγει δὲ κύριος. In 16: 5 λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή precedes a quotation from En 89: 55; 66: 67. Other formulae are "Isaiah says" (12) and "Moses said" (12), among others.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* (c. 150?) cites passages from 1 Thess, Eph, James, Heb, Rom, Mk, Mt, Acts, Jn, several O. T. Apoc., and the books of Ps, Jer, Joel, Prov, among others. The writer never uses a formula of introduction, so he doesn't use γραφή anywhere. Consequently passages from the O. T., Apoc., and N. T. seem to be cited on the same basis of authority. In fact, allusions or brief quotations from two or three of these groups of works occur sometimes in the same context (e. g., *Man.* 1; *Vis.* 4: 3: 4), and sometimes passages from both O. and N. Testaments are integrally combined in the same sentence. In *Vis.* 3: 11: 3 elements of the Gr. text of Ps 54: 23 and 1 Pet 5: 7 are combined into a composite quotation: "and did not cast your cares upon the Lord." In *Sim.* 9: 13: 7 phrases from Eph 4: 4; 2 Cor 13: 11 (or Phil 2: 2; 4: 2; Rom 12: 16); and Ps 14: 2 are combined into one sentence. In the same way elements of the Gr. text of Ps 19: 5 and Rev 21: 2 are combined in *Vis.* 4: 2: 1. Cf. also *Man.* 1 where phrases from Eph 3: 9 and 2 Macc 7: 28 are combined.

The *Didache* (c. 100-150?) is also full of brief quotations and allusions from the Synoptics, Paul, several O. T. and Apoc. books, including one or two references from Jn. As in Hermas, passages are usually cited without a formula or the name of the book cited. Passages from two or more sources are sometimes combined in the same context or even the same sentence, though the phrases may not be as literal as in Hermas (cf., e. g., 1: 2, 4; 16). Sometimes a quotation is preceded by a reference to the "gospel": "as the Lord commanded in his gospel" (ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ), of Mt 6: 9 ff. in 8: 2. In 15: 3 an allusion to Mt 5: 22 ff. or 18: 15 ff. is followed with ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

¹⁾ Latin text and Gr. paraphrase taken from the Athens edition of the *Library of Greek Fathers* 3 (1955), p. 19.

In 14: 3 a quotation from Mal 1: 11 and 1: 14 is introduced with the formula: αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ κυρίου.

1 *Clement* (c. 75-110?) uses a variety of formulae to introduce quotations from the O. T., though his favorite one seems to be γέγραπται either alone or usually with γάρ (4: 1; 14: 4; 17: 3; 29: 2; 36: 3; 39: 3; 42: 5; 48: 2 (with καθώς); 50: 4, 6). He also uses ἡ γραφή λέγει to cite an O. T. passage (34: 6; 35: 7); cf. "as the scripture also bears witness" (23: 5). Others are "Abraham says" for Gen 18: 27 (17: 2); "Moses said" for Ex 3: 11 (17: 5). For further variety in introducing citations cf. 13: 2; 16: 2; 21: 2; 22: 1; 27: 5; 33: 5; 56: 3; especially 3: 1: καὶ ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον (of Dt 32: 15; cf. Jn 19: 28). Cf. καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει οὕτως (of Is 1: 16 ff. in 8: 4); καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει (of Ps 17: 26 f. in 46: 3); cf. also 29: 3 and cf. Jn 19: 37. Quotations, allusions, and echoes of the N. T. are, with one or two exceptions, given without a formula or name of work (e. g., 2: 7; 17: 1; 24: 5; and others); so also occasionally references to the O. T. (e. g., 2: 8; 8: 2 ff.; and others). An interesting passage is 36: 3 where γέγραπται γάρ οὕτως introduces a quotation either from Ps 104: 4 or Heb 1: 7. A checking of texts reveals that the Greek of *Clement* agrees word for word with Heb 1: 7 as against the LXX AB and MT. Unless he had a different text, this is a clear case of that formula being used to introduce a quotation from the N. T. Immediately following this quotation are two others from Ps 2: 7 f. and 110: 1 which are quoted exactly in Heb 1: 5 and 1: 13 as in the LXX B. But *Clement* continues the quotation from Ps 2 further than does Heb. However, in the sentence immediately before our passage *Clement* has quoted three words from Heb 1: 3 which are not from the O. T., and this further confirms his use of Heb 1 here along with the Pss. In 13: 1 definite quotations from Jer 9: 23 f. and 1 Cor 1: 31 are conflated and introduced with the formula: ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον, λέγει γάρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. In 42: 5 he quotes Is 60: 17 as the main source under the influence of some Christian passage such as Phil 1: 2 ff.; 1 Cor 3: 5; 2 Cor 11: 15; Eph 6: 21; Col 1: 7; 4: 7 with the formula: οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή. Some Christian source such as Ja 1: 8 or 4: 8 and 2 Pet 3: 3-10 lies behind the quotation of 23: 3 introduced with: πόρρω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφή αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει. But cf. 2 *Clem.* 11: 2 where the same quotation is introduced by λέγει γάρ καὶ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος.

After all this in 1 *Clement* one wonders how much his words, "You have studied the sacred scriptures" (τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς) in 45: 2 and "You have a good understanding of the sacred scriptures" (τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς) in 53: 1 really mean. The term τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς, used by him

only here, seems to include the "writings" of the N. T. which he knew and apparently used on the same basis of authority as those of the O. T.

This great variety of usages, especially in 1 *Clement* and others who probably stand closest to Jn in time, would seem to indicate that the use of particular formulae to introduce quotations, phrases, echoes, and allusions from either the O. or N. Testament is not so much a matter of chronological development or geographical location as a matter of personal taste for choice of words and style. One writer, e.g., 1 *Clement*, may use γραφή; but others from about the same time, e.g., *Didache* and *Hermas*, do not.

Virtually every usage in Jn may be found also in the earliest Fathers. The only real difference is that in Jn the element of "fulfillment" is still very strongly present which puts him closer, perhaps, to the earliest apologists. This element, however, comes out again in later Christian writers, i. e., the idea that "scripture" was "fulfilled" in Jesus.

Let us now list some of the most striking likenesses between Jn and the earliest Fathers. Jn, like 1 *Clement*, e. g., uses as a formula the noun γραφή and a form of the verb γράφω, and occasionally these formulae, without any apparent difference in meaning, may introduce quotations from N. T. as well as O. T. writers. Cf. Jn 7: 42 and examples from 1 *Clement* and others given above. 1 *Clement* prefers the form γέγραπται, whereas Jn prefers the participle form γεγραμμένον. Jn uses the form of the verb γράφω and the noun γραφή about an equal number of times while 1 *Clement* has a slight preference for the verb form.

Jn like the Fathers uses allusions, phrases, and echoes from O. T. and N. T. writers, especially Paul and the Synoptists¹⁾ without the use of a formula. Sometimes these are used in the same context and even in the same sentence.²⁾ Occasionally such passages in the Fathers may be introduced with a formula, even one which uses γραφή. Jn 7: 42 is a clear case of this same procedure.

The Fathers who use Mic 5: 1 always show influence from Mt 2: 5 f. Compare the combination of passages in Jn 7: 42 with that in Polycarp, *Phil.* 12: 1. Other combinations of passages in Jn not regarded as quotations closely resemble combinations like those found in *Hermas*, *Didache*, and 1 *Clement*.

This brief survey of the use of γραφή and other formulas to introduce

¹⁾ This is a subject outside the scope of our present study, but cf., e.g., Jn 2: 5 and Gen 41: 55; Jn 1: 51 and Gen 28: 12; Jn 3: 35; 7: 29; 10: 14 f. and Mt 11: 27; Jn 6: 63 and 2 Cor 3: 6.

²⁾ The prologue is a good example of this style.

quotations, phrases, allusions, etc. in early Christian writers is sufficient to indicate that Jn might use γραφή to introduce a passage from a gospel or a few words from Paul. Jn may, at times, confuse "writings" of the Synoptists and Paul which he had read at one time with his O. T. In 7: 42 as elsewhere Jn uses the sources of his quotation in his own creative way, especially those of Mt 2: 5 f.; Lk 2: 4, 11; and, perhaps, Rom 1: 3.

We turn now to a consideration of several other passages in Jn and other N. T. writings. They throw additional light on the use of ἡ γραφή in Jn 7: 42.

The context of Jn 2: 22—"they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said"—may indicate that "the scripture" refers to the passage from Ps 69: 10 quoted in 2: 17. But "the word" of Jesus spoken in 2: 19 stands on the same authority as scripture in the minds of his disciples after Jesus was raised from the dead. λόγος is clearly used for a "word" or saying of Jesus also in 7: 36; 15: 20; 18: 9, 32. Note that in 7: 36 the "word" of Jesus had just been spoken in 7: 34; in 15: 20 the "word" had been spoken in 13: 16. Note especially that in 18: 9 his "word" spoken in 6: 39 and 17: 12 is "fulfilled" and that in 18: 32 the "word" spoken in 3: 14 and 12: 32 has "fulfillment" (ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ). In the same way "the word (λόγος) written in their law" ¹⁾ had fulfillment in Jn 15: 25. Hence the "word" of Jesus himself and the "word" of the law are "fulfilled" in Jesus in the same way as O. T. "scripture" is fulfilled in him in 13: 18 and 19: 24, 36.²⁾

At several places in Jn ἡ γραφή seems to refer to a former saying of Jesus in the gospel itself or to a passage in the Synoptics rather than to a passage in O. T. scripture. In 17: 12 the "scripture" may refer to Ps 41: 10 quoted in 13: 18. But since the passage is obviously referred to in 18: 9 where the words of Jesus are spoken of as having fulfillment apart from any appeal to the O. T., it seems that in 17: 12 ἡ γραφή also refers to the words of Jesus formerly spoken in 6: 39, 70 f. and now having fulfillment (cf. also 13: 2, 27). In 20: 9 the "scripture" seems to refer to Lk 24: 46. There really is no O. T. or Rabbinic belief that the messiah should rise from the dead. There is no testimony for such belief in spite of the fact that Hos 6: 1 ff. and Jon 1: 17 (Heb. 2: 1) are usually cited as O. T. "scripture" referred to in places like this. Furthermore the Gr. of Jn 20: 9: οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν τὴν γραφὴν, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι

¹⁾ In this case Ps 35: 19; 69: 4. νόμος is used in the broader sense of the term. Cf. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 75 ff.

²⁾ The words of Jesus also stand on the same authority with those of the law in 1 Cor 9: 8 f. and 9: 14.

shows the use of Lk 24: 46: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν in typical Johannine fashion. That ἡ γραφή and γέγραπται in Lk 24: 45 f. already refer to some saying of Jesus, as in Jn, seems to be the most likely explanation of the use of those terms there. What "is written" refers to the record of the prediction of Jesus' passion in Mk 8: 31 ff. and parallels.¹⁾

In summary, ἡ γραφή in Jn seems to be used in three possible ways: (1) to refer to a specific passage or passages from the O. T. as in 10: 35; 13: 18; 19: 24, 36, 37; αἱ γραφαί in 5: 39 refers to the O. T. in general; (2) to refer to a saying of Jesus given earlier in the gospel as in 17: 12; (3) to indicate the use of a Synoptic passage as in 7: 42 and 20: 9.

In addition to Jn other passages in the N. T. throw interesting light on the meaning of ἡ γραφή in Jn 7: 42. By the time of the writing of 1 Tim and 2 Pet the term had come to include passages from earlier N. T. writings as well as from O. T. scriptures. In 1 Tim 5: 18 two quotations, one from the O. T. (Dt 25: 4) and one from the N. T. (Lk 10: 7), are joined with καὶ and introduced by the formula: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή. The quotation from Dt is as in LXX B except for the word order; the one from Lk is quoted exactly except for the omission of γάρ.²⁾ In 1 Cor 9: 1-15 Paul uses these two passages in the same context. He quotes the first in the same order as LXX B but uses κημόω instead of φιμόω with the formula ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται (vs. 9). He alludes to the second with the words: "Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel" (vs. 14). Paul thinks of the words of Jesus as being on the same level with O. T. scripture; and in 1 Tim both the O. T. and the gospel of Lk are quoted on the same basis of authority. In 2 Pet 3: 16 Paul's letters, or the collection³⁾ of his letters, have the same authority as "the other scriptures" (τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς). The "other scriptures" presumably include N. T. writings in addition to the letters of Paul along with the O. T. In 1 Cor 15: 3-8 the words κατὰ τὰς γραφάς probably include writings from the Christian tradition like those that came to be recorded in Mk 8: 27-33 and parallels and Mk 16: 1 ff. and parallels; Lk 24: 25-35, 44-49; cf. also Jn 21: 15 ff.; Acts 13: 32-37; 17: 2 f. Paul may be alluding to Hos 6: 2; Jon 2: 1; Is 53 f.; but the context makes it plain that Christian "writings" are included, if indeed, the reference is not only to them. In Ja 4: 5f. passages

¹⁾ Cf. Acts 17: 2, 11; 18: 24 f., 28.

²⁾ In the parallel passage Mt 10: 10 has τροφῆς instead of μισθοῦ.

³⁾ Cf. A. E. Barnett, *The New Testament: Its Making and Meaning* (1958), p. 269.

from both the O. and N. Testaments are used in the same context. The second quotation is clearly from Prov 3: 34, but the first is not so obvious and does not occur exactly in either O. T., N. T., or Apoc. Commentators have had difficulty with Ja 4: 5 f. because they have assumed that ἡ γραφή always refers to O. T. scripture. The quotation may come from some unknown source; but I suggest that it is a free quotation from some Christian writings like those in 1 Cor 3: 16; 6: 19, along with other passages like Rom 1: 29 and Gal 5: 19-21.

The evidence presented is sufficient to show that the assumption that ἡ γραφή in the N. T. always refers to a passage or passages from O. T. scriptures is wrong. Sometimes it also includes early Christian writing, probably in the form of sayings of Jesus or about Jesus.

With respect to the quotation in Jn 7: 42, our argument may, perhaps, be stated better in another way. The tradition of Jesus' birth at Bethlehem was of Christian origin. After the tradition had arisen, it continued to survive on the authority of O. T. scripture as it was used in the composition of the gospels. Therefore, ἡ γραφή in the mind of Jn may still have a special meaning from its association with passages from O. T. scripture; but his direct source for the quotation is the written Christian tradition of Mt and Lk, if not the actual gospel passages themselves.

CHAPTER SEVEN

YOU ARE GODS

Jn 10: 34

Texts

Jn 10: 34

οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν
ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπα· θεοί ἐστε;

Ps 82: 6 (LXX B)

ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοί ἐστε
καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες·

Ps 82: 6 (MT)

אני־אמרתי אלהים אתם
ובני עליין כלכם

Ps 82: 6 (Targ.)

אני אמרית הי כמלאכיא אתון חשיבין
והיך אנגלי מרומא כולכון

In response to the Jews who were about to stone him for blasphemy, Jesus quotes from Ps 82: 6 with the formula οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι. The quotation is found nowhere else in the N. T., nor does the exact formula occur elsewhere. But cf. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι (1 Cor 14: 21); καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι (Lk 2: 23); κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου (Lk 2: 24); ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; (Lk 10: 26).

It is hard to understand why Jesus, a Jew, would use the expression "in your law." The words "your law" are characteristic of Gentile speakers when referring to the Jewish law. So by Pilate in Jn 18: 31 and by Gallio in Acts 18: 15.¹⁾ The reading ὑμῶν, omitted in P⁴⁵ and some other authorities but included in P⁶⁶, is to be retained as the correct one in light of Jn's whole treatment of Jesus and the law. He definitely

¹⁾ For references to the same usage by Gentiles in Rabbinic literature cf. Dodd, *The Interpretation*, p. 82 and Schlatter, *op. cit.*, pp. 206 f.

presents Jesus as being outside of or above the Jewish legal system. "The law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (1: 17). In every instance where Jesus himself speaks of the law he speaks of it as given "to you," that is, the Jews (7: 19), or refers to the law as "your law" (8: 17; 10: 34); or "their law" (15: 25). The only possible exception is in 7: 23 where Jesus says, "That the law of Moses may not be broken," without the use of the pronoun. But even these words must be understood as part of the same context in which Jesus definitely sets himself apart from the laws of Moses. In 7: 19 Jesus had just said, "Did not Moses give you the law? Yet none of you does the law." And in 7: 22, "Moses gave you circumcision." So even here Jesus is made to set himself apart from the law, and his expression in 7: 23 in no way creates a different impression.

With the sayings of Jesus about the law contrast those of Philip: "in the law" (1: 45); the Pharisees: "the law" (7: 49); Nicodemus: "our law" (7: 51); the multitude: "the law" (12: 34); the Jews: "We have a law, and by that law" (19: 7). In no passage is the usage the same as that of Jesus except by the Gentile Pilate in 18: 31. Jn Presents Jesus as above or outside of or, perhaps, as replacing the Jewish law.

The word νόμος is used, as in 12: 34 and 15: 25, for Torah in the broadest sense to cover the whole O. T. That this is the meaning is certain by the reference to the passage cited as ἡ γραφή in 10: 35: "And the scripture cannot be broken." ¹⁾ "Law" is used in the same way in Rom 3: 19 and 1 Cor 14: 21 and frequently in Rabbinic literature. ²⁾

The use of the word εἶπ to introduce direct speech is frequent in Jn; cf., for example, 1: 21, 32; 3: 11; 4: 35; 5: 24; 6: 14. But its use as part of a formula to introduce quotations from the O. T. is limited to those from "the law" with the exception of 7: 42. Cf. 8: 17; 10: 34; 15: 25. So also in 1 Cor 14: 21.

There can be no doubt about the exact source of this quotation. It agrees exactly with the Gr. of Ps 82: 6, which is an exact translation of the Heb. except that it does not translate the pronoun אֲנִי apart from its inclusion in the verb. Cf. Is 41: 23.

The context of this quotation, like so many in Jn, is difficult. It has its setting at the Feast of Dedication in Jerusalem (10: 22-39), but vss. 27-30 seem to belong to Jesus' discourse on the Good Shepherd in

¹⁾ Cf. addition in P⁴⁵.

²⁾ For references see Str.-B., 2, pp. 542 f. and cf. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-86; Schlatter, *op. cit.*, pp. 243^f.

vss. 11-18.¹⁾ As a result of Jesus' statement, "I and the Father are one" (vs. 30), the Jews want to stone him. Jesus says that he has shown them many good works and asks for which one they would stone him. The Jews reply that they do not stone him for a good work, "but for blasphemy; and because you, being a man, make yourself God. Jesus answered them, 'Is it not written in your law, I said, you are gods? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), do you say of the one whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, you are blaspheming, because I said, I am a son ²⁾ of God?' " The last statement makes the context the more complicated because in this context Jesus has not said that he was a (or the) son of God.

Regardless of how the word **אלוהים** in the original O. T. passage may be interpreted,³⁾ it is clear that in accordance with Rabbinic principle Jesus argues with the Jews by quoting scripture to defend himself against their charge of making himself God. If the scripture called them to whom the word of God came gods,⁴⁾ it is not blasphemy for Jesus, whom God consecrated and sent into the world, to call himself a (or the) son of God.

It is difficult to say exactly what constituted blasphemy in Jesus' day.⁵⁾ According to the *Tractate Sanhedrin* 7: 5, "The blasphemer is not guilty until he have expressly uttered the Name."⁶⁾ The point of blas-

¹⁾ Cf. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 294. Contrast Bernard who places vss. 19-29 after 9: 41 (*op. cit.*, 2, pp. 341 ff.).

²⁾ Or "the son" with *P⁴⁵*.

³⁾ "Subordinate deities" (Oesterley, *The Psalms* (1955), p. 374); "pagan gods" (Leslie, *The Psalms* (1949), pp. 120 f.); "The author assails the deification of kings in vogue in his day and confesses that for a time he himself believed in their divine descent" (Buttenwieser, *The Psalms* (1938), p. 770). With these views, and esp. with that of Buttenwieser who denies that they are "judges" on the basis of Ex 21: 6 and 22: 7 f., contrast Bernard who calls them "judges" on that basis (*op. cit.*, 2, p. 367).

⁴⁾ Precisely who or what group is meant cannot be determined with certainty. Barrett thinks the reference is probably not to the prophets "(as is often thought)" (*op. cit.*, p. 320) in spite of the fact that for the construction he points to the LXX of Hos 1: 1. We can add here the LXX of Gen 15: 1; Jer 1: 2; cf. Lk 3: 2. According to Barrett, the most common Rabbinic interpretation "seems to have been that the words were addressed to Israel when they received the Law at Sinai." For references cf. Str.-B., 2, p. 543 and Barrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 319 f. Bultmann, perhaps rightly, limits "the word of God" to that address of God in Ps 82: 6 (*op. cit.*, p. 297, n. 2).

⁵⁾ On this complicated and rather technical problem see G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (1932), 1, pp. 427 f. and Str.-B., 1, pp. 1008-1019; Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (1943), pp. 343 ff.; and Beyer on *βλασφημέω*, etc. in Kittel, *TWZNT*, 1, pp. 620-624.

⁶⁾ *Tractate Sanhedrin Mishnah and Tosefta*, trans. by H. Danby (1919), p. 98. Cf. *1QS* 6: 27-7: 1.

phemy in our context has to do entirely with Jesus making himself one with God (vs. 30) or equal to God (vss. 33 and 38)¹⁾ or the son of God (vs. 36). This is the point of controversy, and it is in his own defense on this point that Jesus quotes the passage from Ps 82: 6. If the point of controversy were on the matter of sonship, the second half of Ps 82: 6 would have been more appropriate for Jesus' defense of himself: "And all of you sons of the Most High." Moreover, in view of the idea of divine sonship in the O. T. and Jewish tradition, there could hardly be opposition by the Jews to Jesus on that point.²⁾ Nor could there be opposition to Jesus for applying the term **אלוהים** to himself. The word, with cognates of it, is applied to various humans at several places in the O. T. Cf. Is 9: 5: "mighty god," **אל גבור** (of the messianic prince); Ezek 31: 11: "the mighty one of the nations," **איל גרים** (probably of Nebuchadrezzar); Ex 4: 16: "and you shall be to him as God," **לאלהים** (Yahweh to Moses); Ex 7: 1: "I have made you as God to Pharaoh, **אלהים** (Yahweh to Moses).³⁾

If the material in Jn with respect to the Jews' attitude toward Jesus can be taken as historical, there must have been Jewish opposition to Jesus' claim—or to Jn's presentation of Jesus' supposed claim—to oneness or equality⁴⁾ of some sort with God. The issue arises at several points in the gospel, and here the opposition culminates in the charge of blasphemy (10: 33)⁵⁾ serious enough to deserve stoning. It is interesting to note with respect to the Jewish feeling toward Jesus that the Targum of Ps 82: 6 differs radically from the MT and LXX, perhaps with a view to avoiding any human equality with God: "I said, you were reckoned just as angels, and you all just as angels on high." In addition to Jn 10: 30-38 cf. 5: 18: "The Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making

¹⁾ For Rabbinic references on these points see Str.-B., 2, pp. 462-465; 542 and Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 318 for some passages in English and his caution that statements from R. Abbahu (c. 300 A.D.) cannot be taken as evidence for views in the time of Jesus. Cf. also Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 183, n. 1.

²⁾ Cf., e.g., Gen 6: 2; Job 1: 6; 29: 1; Dan 3: 25; Ex 4: 22; Hos 11: 1; Jer 31: 9; Ps 2: 7; 2 Sam 7: 14; Ps 82: 6. For additional O. T. references and a full survey of divine sonship in the LXX, Apoc. and Pseud., and in Rabbinic literature see Str.-B., 3, pp. 15-22.

³⁾ Rabbinic exegesis also took **אלהים** in several of these passages as referring to men; cf. Str.-B., 2, pp. 464 f.

⁴⁾ Whether this oneness or equality with God is that of essence or being or purpose or work lies beyond the scope of this work.

⁵⁾ This is the only place where the word "blasphemy" occurs in Jn's gospel, and the verb "blaspheme" occurs only in 10: 36.

himself equal with God"; and 19: 7: "The Jews answered him, 'We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the son of God.'" Cf. also 6: 41, 51 f.; 8: 49-59; 10: 14-21.

That Jesus stands in some unique relationship to God the Father is one of the themes of Jn, prominent from the beginning to the end of the gospel. But it is far easier to discover that such a unique relationship exists than to define precisely what it is. Various elements characterize that relationship to the Father, such as sonship and oneness or equality with God, whether in essence or purpose or mission or work. In the context of which our quotation is a part Jesus does not make a claim to sonship in spite of his reply to the Jews in vs. 36 saying that he had. Perhaps it would be safest to say that Jn presents the Jews here as objecting to Jesus' whole claim to a unique relationship with the Father. This relationship with the Jews' opposition to it is presented in various ways by Jn throughout his gospel. There are many times, of course, when there is no opposition presented.¹⁾ It is to Jesus' claims with respect to his relationship to the Father that the Jews object from time to time. In the context of our quotation Jesus is presented as defending this relationship by means of a quotation from scripture in typical Rabbinic fashion.

The arguments presented are probably those of the author or the early Christians and not those of the historical Jesus. In the Synoptic gospels the sonship of Jesus is presented in a different way. Whereas in Jn, in most cases, Jesus himself speaks of his sonship of God,²⁾ in the Synoptics others proclaim him as the son of God. Cf., for example, the voice at the Baptism and Transfiguration (Mk 1: 11 = Mt 3: 17 = Lk 3: 22; Mk 9: 7 = Mt 17: 5 = Lk 9: 35); Gerasene demoniac (Mk 5: 7 = Mt 8: 29 = Lk 8: 28); those in the boat after the calming of the storm (Mt 14: 33); Peter (Mt 16: 16); the centurion (Mk 15: 39 = Mt 27: 54). The only exception in the Synoptics, so far as I know, is Jesus' acknowledgment of his sonship in answer to the high priest's question, "Are you the Christ, the son of the Blessed?" (Mk 14: 61; but cf. Mt 26: 64 and Lk 22: 67). And only in the passage at the trial in the Synoptics is Jesus criticized by the Jews on the matter of his sonship.

¹⁾ On the whole subject of our discussion here cf. the following: 1: 14, 18, 34, 49; 3: 16 ff., 35; 5: 16-45; 6: 27-59; 7: 15-18, 28-30; 8: 16-59; 9: 35-37; 10: 15-39; 11: 4, 40 f.; 12: 26-28, 49 f.; 13: 1-4; 14: 1-31; 15: 1, 8-10, 15 f., 23-26; 16: 3, 10, 15-17, 23-28, 32; 17: 1-26; 18: 11; 19: 7; 20: 17, 21. Cf. also 1 Jn 1: 2 f., 7; 2: 1, 22-24; 3: 8, 23; 4: 9 f., 14 f.; 5: 5, 9, 13, 20; 2 Jn 3, 9.

²⁾ Exceptions in 1: 34, 49; 20: 31.

There too, as in the context of our quotation, the charge is blasphemy.¹⁾

The relationship of Jesus to the Father is not developed nearly so far in the Synoptics as in Jn. In the Synoptics Jesus does refer to God as Father. He speaks to the Jews about "your Father" (Mt 6: 1-32; Lk 11: 2, 13; 12: 30), and of his own relationship to God as "my Father" (Mt 7: 21; 16: 17, 27; Lk 22: 29). This usage seems to be more nearly like that of the Judaism of Jesus' day. The fact that among the Synoptists Jesus' references to God as Father are most numerous in Mt and least numerous in Mk tends to confirm this observation.²⁾ Yet there are some passages where Jesus stands in a more unique relationship to God as Father, approaching the ideas of Jn. Cf., for example, Mt 10: 32 f.; 11: 27 = Lk 10: 22; Mt 26: 29, 39, 42, 53; Mk 8: 38. It is interesting to note that in the closest parallel between the Synoptics and Jn (Mt 11: 27 = Lk 10: 22; Jn 7: 28 f.; 10: 14 f.; cf. also Jn 3: 35), there is opposition on the part of the Jews to Jesus' words in both instances in Jn.

In view of the evidence presented from the Synoptics, it seems likely that even the Jewish opposition to Jesus for reasons given in the context of our quotation is not historical from the time of Jesus' actual ministry. Rather, the opposition is probably that of non-Christian Jews of Jn's day or of the Synagogue to the beliefs of the Christians or of the church of Jn's time read back into the time of Jesus' active ministry.³⁾ And it appears not unlikely that the whole context, with even the quotation put into Jesus' mouth, is a literary device on the part of Jn to strengthen and present in a different manner his theological view of the uniqueness of Jesus. In the actual writing he becomes so interested in developing his theme of the uniqueness of Jesus respecting his sonship and his equality with God that he is unaware of the inconsistency in the discourse he presents, namely that Jesus uses the quotation from the Ps to support his sonship after it had been introduced to confirm his own belief in Jesus' equality or identity with God (vss. 30 and 33).

¹⁾ It seems impossible to tell which statement at Jesus' trial is regarded as blasphemy. On this insoluble problem cf. the commentaries and Klausner, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-344; C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2ed. (1927), 1, pp. 355-363.

²⁾ Cf. Moore, *op. cit.*, 2, pp. 201-211 and Klausner, *op. cit.*, 377-380.

³⁾ Bultmann comments thus on Jesus' words in vs. 36: "Perhaps the use of Ps 82: 6 stems already from the apologetic tradition of primitive Christianity, which soon had to defend its assertion of the divinity of Jesus against the Jewish polemic." He refers to Str.-B., 2, p. 542 (*op. cit.*, p. 297, n. 4). I cannot accept Bultmann's view, however, that the argument seems strange within the gospel of Jn—if it does have the character of typical old-Christian scripture proofs—and that it is an insertion of the redactor. The passage is too typical of Jn's gospel as a whole.

CHAPTER EIGHT

JESUS' ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM

Jn 12: 13-15

Texts

Jn 12: 13

καὶ ἐκραύγαζον·
ὠσαννά,
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου,
καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

Mk 11: 9 f.

ὠσαννά·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·
εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ·
ὠσαννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

Mt 21: 9

ὠσαννά τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·
ὠσαννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

Lk 19: 38

εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος,
ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·
ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη
καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.

Mt 23: 39 = Lk 13: 35

εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

Ps 118: 25 f. (LXX B)

ὦ κύριε, σῶσον δὴ, . . .
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·

Ps 118: 25 f. (MT)

אנא יהוה הושיענא נא . . .
ברוך הבא בשם יהוה

Ps 20: 10 (LXX B)

κύριε, σῶσον τὸν βασιλέα σου,
καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν

Ps 20: 10 (MT)

יהוה הושיענא
המלך יענו

Jn 12: 14 f.

καθώς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον·
μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών·
ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται,
καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.

Mt 21: 5

εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών·
ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον
καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου.

Gen 49: 11 (LXX B)

δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ τῇ ἔλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ·

Gen 49: 11 (MT)

אסרי לגפן עירה
ולשרק בני אתנו

Zech 9: 9 (LXX B)

χαῖρε σφόδρα, θυγάτηρ Σειῶν· κήρυσσε,
θυγάτηρ Ἰερουσαλήμ· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου
ἔρχεται σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτός,
πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον
καὶ πῶλον νέον.

Zech 9: 9 (MT)

גילי מאד בת-ציון הריעי
בת ירושלם הנה מלכך
יבוא לך צדיק ונושע הוא
עני ורכב על-חמור
ועל-עיר בן-אתנות

Zeph 3: 14-16 (LXX B)

χαῖρε, θυγάτηρ Σειῶν, κήρυσσε, θυγάτηρ
Ἰερουσαλήμ· εὐφραίνου καὶ κατατέρπου
ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, θυγάτηρ Ἰερουσαλήμ. . .
βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ . . . οὐκ ὄψη . . .
θάρσει Σειῶν . . .

Zeph 3: 14-16 (MT)

רני בת-ציון הריעו
ישראל שמחי ועלוי
בכל-לב בת ירושלם . . .
מלך ישראל . . . לא-תיראי . . .
אל-תיראי ציון . . .

John's account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem is built around two quotations from the O. T. (Ps 118: 25 f. in 12: 13 and Is 40: 9 (?) with Zech 9: 9 in 12: 15). The first quotation is unique in that it is the only specific one, as distinct from allusions, not introduced (or followed) by a formula. However, the words of Jesus' disciples in vs. 16 give the fulfillment character to it as in 2: 17, 22. It is also cited without a formula ¹⁾ in the Synoptics where it occurs in the context of the entry into Jerusalem (Mk 11: 9 f. = Mt 21: 9 = Lk 19: 38) and in the context of the lament over Jerusalem (Mt 23: 39 = Lk 13: 35). Jn puts it in the words of the great crowd who went out to meet Jesus who was coming to Jerusalem. The quotation in 12: 13 belongs to a sort of group of quotations in Jn, where two separate quotations follow each other

¹⁾ Other specific O. T. quotations do occur in the Synoptics without a formula; so usually in Mk (e. g., 2: 26; 4: 12, 29, 32; 6: 34; 8: 18); cf. Mt 9: 13; 12: 40; Lk 4: 26; 8: 10.

closely as here in 12: 13-15; 12: 38-40; and 19: 36-38. Yet these are not compound quotations like that in 7: 42.

The source of the first quotation is clearly Ps 118: 25 f. The line εὐλογ. . . . κυρίου, quoted the same way in every passage in the gospels except Lk 19: 38 where the words ὁ βασιλεύς are inserted between ἐρχ. and ἐν, is exactly as the LXX(BA), which is an exact translation of the Heb.

The context of our quotations in the Synoptics differs in several important respects from that of Jn. The Synoptics agree in placing the quotation at the end of the narrative of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. In Jn the entry into Jerusalem is not a separate narrative but is inserted (12: 12-16), rather superficially, into the longer narrative of the raising of Lazarus, with the Jewish plot to take Jesus (11: 1-57), and its sequel of the anointing at Bethany, with the desire of the common people to see Jesus and Lazarus (12: 1-11), and the witness of the crowd that was with Jesus when he raised Lazarus (12: 17). The Lazarus narrative is concluded with the words: "For this reason the multitude went to meet him, because they heard that he had done this sign.¹⁾ The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, 'You see that you can do nothing; lo, the world has gone after him' " (12: 18 f.). Hence, in Jn the enthusiastic reception given to Jesus at his entry into Jerusalem for the Passover is definitely connected with the Lazarus miracle.

In the four gospels the quotation is put in the words of the crowd. But in Mk and Mt²⁾ the crowd precedes and follows Jesus, whereas in Jn the crowd, already in Jerusalem, goes out to meet Jesus. Mk reads: "And those who went before and those who followed (καὶ οἱ . . . καὶ οἱ . . .) shouted" (ἔκραζον); Mt: "And the crowds that went before him and those that followed shouted saying" (ἔκραζον λέγοντες); Lk: "The whole multitude of disciples (ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν), rejoicing, began to praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen, saying"; Jn: "The great crowd (ὁ ὄχλος πλὺς) that had come to the feast . . . were shouting" (or "continued to shout," ἐκράυγαζον). In Mk and Mt the crowd spread their garments and branches on the road;³⁾ in Jn the crowd "took branches from palm trees and went out to meet him."

In the Synoptics two disciples went and found the colt⁴⁾ (τὸν πῶλον),

¹⁾ A part of Jewish belief about the messiah was that signs would herald his coming. Cf. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 f.; Str.-B., I, pp. 640 f.

²⁾ Lk 19: 37 differs slightly on this point.

³⁾ In Lk only garments.

⁴⁾ In Mt the ass and colt.

brought it to Jesus, and put their garments on it. In Jn Jesus himself found a young ass (ὄνάριον) and sat on it. Mk and Lk lack the quotation from Zech 9:9 whereas Mt and Jn include it as part of the context of our quotation, but the two quotations are given in reverse order. In Mt the citation from Zech is introduced with the formula, "This took place to fulfill that which was spoken through the prophet saying" and comes after Jesus' instructions to the two disciples. In Jn the citation from Zech is introduced with the words, "Just as it is written," and comes after Jesus found the ass and sat on it. In Mt, as perhaps in Jn, the quotation from Zech is conflated with one from Is.

In the Synoptics the quotation from the Ps is followed immediately by an additional exclamation,¹⁾ but in Jn the quotation from Zech is followed with the words: "These things his disciples did not understand at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written about him ²⁾ and that they had done these things to him." In the Synoptics the narratives of Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem and his cleansing the temple follow this context, but in Jn there is no mention of those things here.

The context of the two quotations in Jn is a wholly superficial one. Jn's main interest is certainly not Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Rather, Jn has taken elements from the Synoptic account of that incident and inserted them into the framework of the Lazarus story at an appropriate point in the development of one of the main themes of his gospel—Jesus as king. The evidence for this view is given as we proceed with our study of the quotation from Ps 118:25 f.

The word ὁσιεύει is a transliteration of the Heb. הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא ³⁾ which in the Ps is used as a prayer or supplication in the sense of "help" or "save now." יִשַׁע in the Hi. imv. is always used in the suppliant sense of "help" or "save" in the O. T. The exact form הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא (with the particle נָא) occurs only in Ps 118:25; cf., however, הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ נָא (LXX simply σῶσον ἡμεῖς) in 2 Kgs 19:19. Cf., further, e.g., הוֹשַׁע in Jer 31:7 (ἔσωσεν) and Ps 86:2 (σῶσον); הוֹשַׁע in 2 Sam 14:4 (σῶσον); הוֹשִׁיעָה in 2 Kgs 6:26 (σῶσον); ⁴⁾ הוֹשִׁיעָה לָנוּ in Josh 10:6 (αὐτὸν ἐξέλεο ἡμεῖς); וְהוֹשִׁיעָה לָנוּ in Ps 86:16 (αὐτὸν σῶσον τὸν ἐλπίστὸν); ⁵⁾ הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ in Jer 17:14 (σῶσόν με);

¹⁾ Cf. Mk 11:10; Mt 21:9; Lk 19:38.

²⁾ Cf. also 2:17, 22.

³⁾ Perhaps from the shortened imperative form הוֹשַׁעָנָא.

⁴⁾ The same Heb. and Gr. forms occur also in the same sense in Pss 12:2; 20:10; 28:9; 60:7; 108:7.

⁵⁾ The same Heb. and Gr. forms occur also in Pss 3:8; 6:5; 7:2; 22:22; 31:17; 54:3; 59:3; 69:2; 109:26; 119:94, 146; cf. also 2 Kgs 16:7; Ps 71:2.

in Is 37: 20 (σῶσον ἡμᾶς).¹⁾ At no place are the Heb. forms translated with ὁσαννά but always with the form σῶσον ²⁾ or an equivalent.³⁾ Moreover, the word ὁσαννά occurs nowhere in the LXX. How, then, are we to understand its use in the gospels? ⁴⁾

Perhaps the word "hosanna" is not derived from the O. T. directly but is the rendering of part of a Jewish hymn or liturgy.⁵⁾ But that its new meaning is the result of Christian liturgies beginning with the *Didache* and *Apost. Const.*⁶⁾ seems unlikely.

Some interpreters, assuming gospel translations from original Hebrew or Aramaic into Greek, translate ὁσαννά as "help" or "save now" in accordance with the usage of the Heb. and Gr. O. T.⁷⁾ Torrey, dealing with Mt 21: 9 and parallels,⁸⁾ says that "this most important passage has never been correctly interpreted by commentators" because the Gr. "can be understood only through retroversion into the original Hebrew." All four gospel writers give "the verbal quotation from Ps. 118, together with more or less distinct reminiscences of Ps. 20." He reconstructs the Heb. of Mt and translates: "(Lord,) save the Son of David!/Blessed is He that comes in the name of the Lord. / O give thy help from on high!" Torrey says the Gr. Mt, "though it reproduces the Hebrew exactly, and therefore cannot, strictly speaking, be termed a false rendering, is a most unfortunate specimen of translation Greek." The Gr. Mt, "though quite defensible from the point of view of the translator, was certain to mislead Gentile readers, and has misled modern scholars. The ל in לבן indicated the direct object, as constantly in Aramaic and very frequently (also with the verb הושיע) in the later Hebrew of the O. T.⁹⁾ The true meaning of ὁσαννά τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ was therefore 'Help the Son of David!' corresponding to the 'God save the (Messianic) king!' of

¹⁾ So also Ps 106: 47; 1 Chr 16: 35 (ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς); Jer 2: 27.

²⁾ Except in Jer 31: 7 and 1 Chr 16: 35 where the LXX changes the meaning.

³⁾ Only exception to σῶσον is ἐξελοῦ in Josh 10: 6.

⁴⁾ Cf. esp. the article by Eric Werner and the many views he presents in " 'Hosanna' in the Gospels," *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 97-122.

⁵⁾ For this view cf. T. K. Cheyne, "Hosanna" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 2 (1901), col. 2119; Werner, *op. cit.*, pp. 116 ff.; Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 65 f.

⁶⁾ Cf. Werner, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-112.

⁷⁾ Cf. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 119; E. P. Gould, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, ICC (1955), pp. 208 f.; cf. the similar views of others presented by Werner.

⁸⁾ *Documents*, pp. 77 f.; *The Four Gospels*, p. 295, n. on Mt 21: 9; *Our Translated Gospels*, pp. 21 f.

⁹⁾ I can find only two examples of ל with הושיע in the O. T.: Josh 10: 6 and Ps 86: 16.

Ps 20: 10." Torrey translates Mk 11: 9 f.: "God save him! . . . God in heaven save him!"¹⁾ So for ὁσαννά in Jn 12: 13.²⁾

Werner³⁾ restores the Gr. of Mt 21: 9 into Heb. which corresponds to that of Torrey except for an initial ויקרא. On the basis of restored Heb. he translates Mt 21: 9, 15 and Mk 11: 9 f. as follows: "And they cried to the Son of David: 'Save now. Blessed by the name of JHVH be he who cometh.' 'Save now in the highest.' . . . The children in the Sanctuary cried out to the Son of David: 'Save now!' . . . And they cried: 'Save now!' . . . 'Save now in the highest!'"

Such restorations and translations may be sound but are not really necessary to an understanding of the Gr. texts as we now have them. We must take the present Gr. texts of the passages in question at face value and assume that the writers of the present gospels were using the Heb. and/or Gr. O. T. rather than Heb. or Aram. gospels. For the word ὁσαννά they probably were using a Heb. text, presumably that of Ps 118: 25 or possibly Ps 20: 6, 10, as Torrey suggests. However, since the Heb. הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא occurs only in Ps 118: 25 in the O. T., it must be the direct source of our quotation. But Ps 20 played a part in the idea of messianic kingship, and it may better be thought of as a source of the quotation for Jn than for Mt.

With respect to "hosanna," the evidence indicates that the gospel writers deliberately rendered the Heb. with the transliteration ὁσαννά rather than with a translation.⁴⁾ To translate the Heb. would have meant to render it with σωσον δὴ, and this would give the meaning, "Save now!" But that is precisely the meaning the first evangelist wanted to avoid. Because he did understand the Heb. הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא and its translation with σωσον δὴ in the LXX, he used a transliteration. A suppliant feeling did not fit in with the mood of joy and praise which prevails in each of the four gospels. Since the word ὁσαννά does not occur in the

¹⁾ *The Four Gospels*, p. 94.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 213. Goodspeed trans., "God bless him!" *KJ*, *ASV*, Moffatt, and *RSV* avoid the difficulty by retaining "Hosanna." Cf. Burkitt's suggestion that hosanna represents a misunderstanding of the Heb. for " 'Hosanna upwards,' i.e. 'Up with your wands!' . . . 'Up with your palms!' . . . The best English equivalent for Hosanna, . . . will be 'God save Israel!' " (Montefiore, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 260 f.).

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 112 f.

⁴⁾ Torrey can't avoid the fact of transliteration: "Grk. Mk. had transliterated the 'hosanna,' twice, and Grk. Mt. wished, as usual, to follow this lead . . . The reason why Mk. transliterated his 'hosanna' is evident. In the text which he rendered the imperative stood alone, as in Ps. 118: 25, without an expressed object. He would reproduce the shout of the people; no word of translation could give such a vivid touch" (*Our Translated Gospels*, pp. 21 f.).

LXX and occurs only in the gospels in the N. T.,¹⁾ it appears to be an early Christian creation—the full meaning of which cannot be determined for lack of sufficient evidence—which had its origin in the primitive gospel tradition. The Heb. “hosanna” was given a new meaning by the invention of a new Gr. word through deliberate transliteration of that Heb. On the basis of the evidence, I believe the term should be translated into English with some such verb as “give praise” or “give glory,” indicative of a feeling of reverent joy and gladness.²⁾ The evidence which seems sufficient to confirm this point of view follows.

The mood of the context in the four gospels is that of praise and joy. The very word “praise” (αἶνος) itself occurs in Mt 21: 16. Here it is significant that the word αἶνος occurs only in the LXX of Ps 8: 3 (for ἰσ, “strength”), which Jesus is said to quote as an interpretation of the children’s cry, ὡσαννά τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ, in vs. 15. Lk omits the cry “hosanna” and the word “shouted,” but in his own way he expressed the meaning he felt in Mk (and Mt). In 19: 37 the “whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice” (ἤρξαντο . . . χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ). After the quotation Lk (19: 38) adds: “Peace in heaven and glory in the highest” (δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις);³⁾ ὡσαννά understood as a synonym for δόξα or δὸς δόξαν would be enough of itself to explain the dative of Mt 21: 9, 15 (τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ)⁴⁾ and the expression ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις of Mt 21: 9 and Mk 11: 10.⁵⁾ The latter phrase can be

¹⁾ And only in the passages which concern us here, Mk 11: 9 f.; Mt 21: 9 (twice), 15; Jn 12: 13. Lk omits it.

²⁾ This view of “glory” or “praise” is, of course, not new. Cf. the views of W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*, ICC (1951), p. 221; A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (1925), p. 296; and several presented by Werner, *op. cit.* Cf. esp. G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (1902), p. 221.

³⁾ Here contrast the view of Eisler that Lk’s “peace in heaven” is “senseless,” refuted by Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n. 21. Cf. also Montefiore, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 260 f.

⁴⁾ As well as the much disputed passage in *Didache* 10: 6: ὡσαννά τῷ θεῷ Δαυίδ. θεῷ here is to be understood as in Dan 5: 1 (title) and Lk 2: 14.

⁵⁾ Here contrast the statement of Werner who says that “hosanna in the highest” can never be understood as praise (*op. cit.*, p. 100). Cf. also Dalman, who says that Mt’s dative and Lk’s phrase ἐν ὑψίσ. indicate that Mt was “no Hebraist” and that Lk also “did not understand Hebrew.” He suggests that ἐν τοῖς ὑψίσ. “had been a substitute for the name of God, which, from the tenor of Ps. 118: 25, ought properly to have been expressed here. But deliverance ought, of course, to have come ‘from the highest,’ and not be given ‘to the highest.’ In the former sense only could parallel Jewish expressions be found” (*op. cit.*, p. 221). But the phrase is really “in the highest,” and for references to the idea of praise to “God in the highest” see below. Dalman adds that Mk’s addition “is presumably the mistaken view of ὡσαννά to be found in the early Church” and that the original form of the cry is Mk 11: 9. But note that the form in Jn is the same as that in Mk.

understood best in light of Lk 2: 14 and 19: 38.¹⁾ Lk is our first interpreter of these passages from Mk and Mt.

Several passages from the LXX throw light on the phrase ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις and the word ὡσαννά. The exact phrase occurs only once in the LXX, Ps 148: 1: αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν (i.e., κύριον) ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. But the use of ὑψιστος for עֲלִיּוֹן is very frequent. The passage from Ps 148 and others, as Sir 17: 27; 26: 16; 43: 9; Dan 4: 32; 5: 1 (title); Job 16: 20; and Wis 9: 17, would make it easy for Christians to change the meaning of "hosanna" from the suppliant sense of "save now" to the sense of "give glory" (or "glory") or "give praise" (or "praise").²⁾ In view of the evidence presented one can hardly label the interpretation of Clement of Alexandria "mistaken, false, and even fantastic."³⁾ After quoting from Mt 21: 9, Clement adds the comment: φῶς καὶ δόξα καὶ αἶνος μεθ' ἡμετέρης τῷ κυρίῳ, "for this is the meaning of the expression 'hosanna' when translated into Greek" (*Paed.* 1: 5).⁴⁾ The passages in Mk and Mt make good sense in Greek when understood in this way.

With respect to the source of the quotation in Jn, there are factors which indicate that the direct source for him was the Synoptics rather than the O. T.⁵⁾ Jn, like Mk, gives the quotation without any insertions between ὡσαννά and κυρίου. In the Synoptics it has no formal formula of introduction. While the same thing is true for other quotations in the Synoptics, this is the only direct quotation in Jn without a formula of introduction. Whereas the word εὐλογέω occurs in the Synoptics outside

¹⁾ Understood in this light it does not mean, "Let those in the heights of heaven say, Hosanna" (Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 221).

²⁾ The fact that Ps 118 was a part of the Jewish Hallel sung at the festivals of Passover, Tabernacles, and Dedication, festivals of joy as well as supplication, also aided the Christians in making the transition. Verbs of rejoicing are part of the line before our quotation in Ps 118: 24: "We will rejoice and be glad in it" [בָּ, i.e., in the "day which the Lord has made"]. Was the first evangelist influenced by this line so that he took the בָּ as "in him," i.e., the messiah? In 2 Esd 7: 28 the messiah will bring rejoicing to those who are alive when he comes: "For my son the messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him, and those who remain shall rejoice four hundred years." Expressions of our contexts, such as peace, glory, praise, joy, lack of fear, honor, etc. are a usual part of the messianic mood of the O. T.; cf., e.g., Pss 20; 21; Is 54; 60; Zeph 3: 14-16; Zech 9: 9 ff.

³⁾ So Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 100, n. 7.

⁴⁾ Irenaeus, quoting Mt 21: 9 prefaces the quotation by saying that the people rejoiced because of the "king's arrival . . . crying out with great joy and gladness" (*Haer.* 4: 11: 3).

⁵⁾ Against Bultmann who says that "the source cannot be one of the Synoptics, for it differs from the synoptic account . . ." (*op. cit.*, p. 319).

the quotation,¹⁾ it occurs nowhere else in Jn. The words καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ after the quotation in Jn seem to be an afterthought from the version in Lk. Lk's words, ὁ βασιλεὺς, inserted within the quotation, provided further incentive for Jn's use of the quotation at this point in his gospel. Although Jn, like Mt, includes the quotation from Zech 9: 9, he omits the words "to the son of David" because they do not fit his unique view of Jesus as king. Jn never uses the phrase "son of David," and he uses the word David only two times, both in a passage which he derived from the Synoptics (7: 42).

We have indicated that Jn rather superficially inserted the story of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem into the larger context of the Lazarus miracle. Lk's mention of "mighty works" (περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων) as the reason for the praises of the multitude may have provided the motive for Jn's insertion of the entry story at this point. In Jn the people wanted to see not only Jesus but Lazarus also "whom he had raised from the dead" (12: 9). After the entry story, Jn says that the crowd with Jesus when he raised Lazarus "bore witness" (12: 17) and that "for this reason also the crowd went and met him, because they heard that he had done this sign" (12: 18).

Jn makes other changes, characteristic of his method when using the Synoptics.²⁾ He has the crowd, already at Jerusalem, go out to meet Jesus, whereas in the Synoptics it is journeying with Jesus on the way to Jerusalem. Instead of Mk's στιβάδας and Mt's κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων Jn has τὰ βᾶτα τῶν φοινίκων. In Mk and Mt the people "cut" (κόψαντες, ἔκοπτον) branches, but in Jn they simply "took" (ἔλαβον) them. For ἔκραζον of Mk and Mt Jn reads ἐκράυγαζον.³⁾ In Mk and Lk the disciples found a colt (πῶλον); in Mt an ass (ὄνον) and a colt (πῶλον); but in Jn Jesus himself found a young ass (ὄνάριον). This change, a *hap. leg.* in Jn, is clearly a stylistic variation. He was about to use ὄνος in the next vs., so here he used ὄνάριον.⁴⁾

There is, thus, sufficient evidence to indicate that Jn used the Synoptics as his source for the quotation in 12: 13, at the same time making several

¹⁾ Cf. Mk 6: 41; 8: 7; 14: 22; Mt 14: 19; 25: 34; 26: 26; Lk 1: 28, 42, 64; 2: 28, 34; 6: 28; 9: 16; 24: 30, 50 f., 53.

²⁾ There are also the characteristic differences in the Synoptic accounts.

³⁾ Here cf. ἐκραυγασαν λεγοντες of P⁶⁶ with Mt 21: 9 where λεγοντες is added; Lk, simply λεγοντες.

⁴⁾ Jn frequently uses synonyms instead of repeating the same word. Cf. C. Tarelli, "Johannine Synonyms," *JTS* 47 (1946), pp. 175 ff.; W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, 3rd ed. (1945), pp. 254 f.; E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (1906), 401-436.

intentional changes in his own characteristic manner. Those changes are in harmony with his purpose for introducing the quotation in the first place at this point in the Lazarus story in the development of his theme of Jesus as king.

Although the theme of Jesus as messianic king is present in each of the Synoptic accounts,¹⁾ it is given clearer expression after Mk. Mk does not have the quotation from Zech 9: 9; his emphasis is on the coming kingdom of David rather than on the king himself (11: 10). To be sure, Mk hardly thought of the kingdom apart from the king, but he does not mention the word "king". Mt does not use the word king in connection with the quotation from the Ps, but he clearly interprets Jesus' riding on the ass as fulfilling the messianic kingship predicted in Zech 9: 9 (Mt 21: 4 f.). Mt's point of emphasis, however, is not on Jesus as king but on the son of David. This is evident from the insertion within the quotation of the words τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ, themselves messianic. Since the expression "son of David" is a favorite one of Mt,²⁾ it would be only natural for him to insert it here. And when Jesus reaches Jerusalem and the people ask who he is, the crowds say: "This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee" (21: 11). Lk, like Mk, lacks the quotation from Zech, but in the quotation from the Ps he clearly emphasizes the concept of kingship by inserting the words ὁ βασιλεύς.³⁾

While the idea of messianic kingship does play a part in the Synoptic account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the Synoptists are also concerned with the whole procession itself and perhaps mostly with Jesus' subsequent cleansing of the temple.⁴⁾ Jn, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with Jesus as king⁵⁾ and only secondarily with the entry into Jerusalem. He has merely taken elements—among them the quotation from Ps 118: 25 f.—from the Synoptic accounts and inserted them into

¹⁾ The word הוֹשִׁיעָה is already used with two messianic passages in the O. T., Ps 20: 7, 10; 28: 8 f. (cf. Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 115, n. 45). Ps 118 was interpreted messianically by Christians and Jews; cf. Mk 12: 10 f. = Mt 21: 42 = Lk 20: 17; Acts 4: 11; 1 Pet 2: 4, 7; Rev 19: 7; Mt 23: 39 = Lk 13: 35; 2 Cor 6: 11. For later Christian and Jewish references cf. Werner, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-119; for Jewish references cf. also Str.-B., 1, pp. 845-850, 876; 2, p. 256.

²⁾ Cf. 1: 1, 20; 9: 27; 12: 23; 15: 22; 20: 30 f.; 21: 15; 22: 42. The expression also occurs in Mk and Lk, but it is not frequent (Mk 10: 47 f.; 12: 35; Lk 18: 38 f.; 20: 41).

³⁾ Yet this is the only place he applies the title "king" to Jesus.

⁴⁾ Cf. J. S. Kennard, "Hosanna and the Purpose of Jesus," *JBL* 67 (1948), pp. 171-176.

⁵⁾ This seems to be the view of Origen, *Comm. on John* 10: 31 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4: 11: 3.

his story of Lazarus as a high point in the development of his theme of Jesus as king. Whereas the Synoptists are little concerned with emphasizing that Jesus is king, the kingship of Jesus becomes a prominent theme in Jn.

Mk does not mention the word "king" with reference to Jesus except in the narrative of the trial and crucifixion.¹⁾ Apart from references to Jesus as king during the trial,²⁾ Mt uses the word "king" as a title for Jesus three times: in the question of the wise men (2: 2); the quotation from Zech 9: 9 (21: 5); and in the passage of the Last Judgment where Jesus refers to himself as king (25: 34, 40). Lk refers to Jesus as king only with his insertion of the word in the quotation from Ps 118: 26 (19: 38), apart from the narratives of the trial.³⁾

In strong contrast to the Synoptics Jesus is spoken of as king at regular intervals in Jn's gospel. Nathanael confesses that Jesus is "king of Israel" (1: 49). After the feeding of the five thousand, when the people "saw the sign" ⁴⁾ which he had done, "they said, 'Truly this is the prophet who is coming into the world' " (6: 14). But Jesus himself perceived that "they were about to come and seize him in order to make him king" (6: 15). Then "the great crowd" proclaims Jesus as king in the Lazarus episode (12: 12-19). Even in the narratives of the trial and crucifixion references to the kingship of Jesus are much more numerous than in the Synoptics, and they are presented in a wholly different light. In the Synoptics Jesus is referred to as king only in mockery, but not so in Jn. Note the difference in Jesus' answer to Pilate's question about his kingship in Jn 18: 33 from that in the Synoptics (Mk 15: 2 = Mt 27: 11 = Lk 23: 3).⁵⁾ In Jn Pilate himself wrote the inscription over the cross, refused the request of the chief priests to change it (19: 19-21), and said in reply: "What I have written I have written" (19: 22).

The theme of Jesus as king is enough to account for Jn's change from *στειβάδας* in Mk and *κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων* in Mt to *τὰ βᾶτα τῶν φοινίκων*.⁶⁾ Such change was in accord with the use of palms in honor of a triumphant king.⁷⁾ The language used in recording the celebration accompanying

¹⁾ Mk 15: 2, 9, 12, 18, 26, 32.

²⁾ Mt 27: 11, 37, 42.

³⁾ Lk 23: 2, 3, 37 f.

⁴⁾ As in the Lazarus story the theme of Jesus as king is introduced after the "sign."

⁵⁾ Cf. the important Johannine addition in 18: 37; cf. also 18: 39; 19: 14 f., 19. Jn also includes the passages spoken in mockery (19: 3, 12).

⁶⁾ This may be pleonastic (Barrett), but the same construction occurs in *Test. Naph.* 5. It is Jn's equivalent to Mt's phrase.

⁷⁾ On this point and on *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* as a messianic title cf. Bultmann, *op. cit.*,

Judas' cleansing of the temple (2 Macc 10: 6 f.) is similar to that of the gospels: "And they kept eight days with gladness (μετὰ εὐφροσύνης) . . . Therefore having boughs and seasonable branches and also palm branches (φοίνικας ἔχοντες), they gave thanks to him who had good success in cleansing the place." So also in 1 Macc 13: 51: "And he entered into it . . . with praise and palm branches (μετὰ αἰνέσεως καὶ βάλων) . . . and hymns and songs (καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς) because a great enemy was blotted out of Israel." ¹) Cf. here Rev 7: 9, the only other place in the N. T. where the word occurs; also Sir 50: 12; 2 Macc 14: 4.

For Jn Jesus is *King* of the Jews. A high point in the development of that theme comes in the Lazarus story when the crowds acknowledge his kingship. And the climax in Jn's conception of that kingship is put in the mouth of Jesus himself: "My kingship is not of this world; if my kingship were of this world, my servants would fight that I might not be handed over to the Jews; but my kingship is not of the world" (18: 36).

The second quotation (Jn 12: 15) in the account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem occurs in the words of the gospel writer.²) As in 6: 31, the formula is καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον. The main part of the quotation is an abbreviated form of Zech 9: 9, conflated with a preceding line from an unknown source. Zech 9: 9, with an additional line, is quoted in Mt 21: 5, where the three line quotation from Zech is conflated with a preceding line from Is 62: 11.³) The line from Is 62: 11 in Mt is exactly as in the LXX B, which is a literal translation of the MT.

Of the two lines which Jn and Mt have in common, their first line is identical except that Jn omits σοι at the end of the line. The line in Mt is the same as in the LXX B which translates the Heb. exactly.

pp. 319, n. 7 and 8; 309, n. 1; 224, n. 4 and the references he gives; Str.-B., 2, p. 548. Bultmann says that εἰς ὑπάντησιν also indicates the entry of the messianic king and important persons (p. 319, n. 7).

¹) In the latter passage Simon himself gives praise to God for the victory. This would tend to support our idea of "glory to God in the highest." Cf. the view of Kennard, who uses these passages to argue that the purpose of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem was primarily to cleanse the temple. The cry of the Jews "had nothing to do with the Messianic ruler, but belonged to the Succoth processions. The colt . . . and the other trappings of royalty with which the story gradually became embellished clash with the spirit of the Psalm. It is not Jesus as Messiah, but 'the kingdom of our father David,' whose coming was being furthered by the Hosannas" (*op. cit.*). This argument may be valid for the Synoptics, esp. Mk, but certainly not for Jn who does not connect the entry with the cleansing of the temple.

²) Others in the words of the writer are in 12: 38; 12: 40; 19: 24; 19: 28; 19: 36; 19: 37.

³) His words διὰ τοῦ προφήτου may indicate that Mt believed the whole quotation from one source; cf. Origen, *Comm. on John* 10: 26.

For the rest of the quotation Mt seems to be closer to the MT than to the LXX. He reproduces the three words for "ass" of the MT as against the two of the LXX. Although Mt has ἐπιβεβηκώς with the LXX, רכב is translated in the LXX with ἐπιβαίνω more often than with all other words together. He translates בן of the MT literally with υἱός rather than with νέος as in the LXX.¹⁾ In their last line Mt is a very literal translation of the MT; and Mt and Jn have only two words in common, ἐπὶ πῶλον. The ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου of Jn is as close to the ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου of Mt as to the ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον of the LXX. Jn could be an abbreviated translation of the Heb.; but, if so, his choice of words is not in accord with LXX usage. ἀθημαι translates רכב only one time in the LXX (Is 19: 1), and his πῶλος translates בן only in Gen 49: 11. πῶλος translates עֵיִר in Gen 32: 15; 49: 11; Jud 10: 4; 12: 14; Zech 9: 9 but never translates אַתָּן and חמור. ὄνος does translate each of the Heb. words for ass, but עִֵיר only in Is 30: 6 and Job 11: 12, as against אַתָּן about 27 times and חמור about 70 times. The Gr. usage of Mt is more in accord with that of the LXX than Jn except that his ὑποζύγιον translates אַתָּן only in Jud 5: 10.

The sources usually given for this quotation in Jn are Is 40: 9 and Zech 9: 9. The words "fear not" do occur in Is 40: 9 and related passages, such as 35: 4; 41: 10, 13; 43: 1, 5; 44: 2; 51: 7; 54: 4; Jer 46: 27 f. in the sing. or pl. inv. form μὴ φοβοῦ or μὴ φοβεῖσθε, for the corresponding form of יִרָא with אֵל. But the four words, "fear not, daughter of Zion," occur nowhere in the same context in the LXX. They do occur in the MT of Zeph 3: 14-17, but there the LXX translates "do not fear" with θάρσει²⁾ and has the vocative form θύγατερ, as regularly, instead of θυγάτηρ. Perhaps Jn translated the Heb. of Zeph³⁾ and either condensed it as a sort of introduction to the main quotation from Zech or quoted bits of it from memory. His preference for Zeph would be the more likely because it contains the phrase "king of Israel,"⁴⁾ which he had just applied to Jesus in vs. 13 after the quotation from Ps 118.

¹⁾ The differences in Mt need not concern us; cf. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 220 and contrast Torrey, *Documents*, pp. 75-77, and Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 119 f.

²⁾ יִרָא with the neg. particle אֵל is translated in the LXX either with μὴ φοβ. (e.g., Gen 15: 1; Dt 31: 6; 1 Sam 22: 23; Is 40: 9; 41: 10) or θάρσει (e.g., Gen 35: 17; 1 Kgs 17: 13; Jud 7: 30; Zeph 3: 16; Zech 8: 13).

³⁾ In *Apol.* 1, 35: 11 Justin quotes Zech 9: 9 as from Zeph. It must be said, however, that at other places also Justin attributes passages to O. T. sources incorrectly.

⁴⁾ Although in Zeph "king" refers to Yahweh himself rather than to the messiah as "king of Israel."

If our suggestion about ὡσαννά conveying the feeling of joy or praise is correct, it is conceivable that Jn's μὴ φοβοῦ is the equivalent of χαῖρε in Zeph 3: 14 or Zech 9: 9. The coming of the messianic king is a time for rejoicing without fear. Strength is given to this argument by the fact that "sing (LXX, χαῖρε), daughter of Zion,"¹⁾ and "do not fear (θάρσει), O Zion," are parallel in Zeph 3: 14, 16 and that "fear not" and "rejoice" (and "be glad") are parallel twice in Joel 2: 21-23.²⁾ The words "do not fear," in the sense of "rejoice," used with ὡσαννά in vs. 13 give excellent balance and variation to Jn's style.

In the line ἰδοὺ . . . ἔρχεται Jn agrees with Mt except for the omission of σοι, which may have been for reasons of meter. In Jn the words καθήμενος . . . ὄνου do not occur exactly in the Heb. or Gr. O. T. καθ. is hardly a translation of the Heb. of Zech since it translates רכב only once in the LXX (Is 19: 1). The words πῶλον ὄνου are clearly not from the LXX of Zech 9: 9 since the word ὄνος is not used there. They may, however, show influence from Gen 49: 11, which came to be interpreted messianically with Zech 9: 9.³⁾ Jn may have "a more literal rendering of the Hebrew,"⁴⁾ but Mt has a most literal translation of the Heb.

Whereas Jn frequently shows a kinship to Rabbinic thought and language,⁵⁾ he does not do so in this quotation. In Rabbinic Judaism the emphasis in the citation of Zech 9: 9 is, as Stendahl says,⁶⁾ on "poor and riding on an ass." Jn omits this picture of Jesus completely.

With respect to the form of the quotation, the view of Barrett,⁷⁾ that "John quoted loosely from memory,"⁸⁾ is tenable. This is true especially for the first line which may be given from memory of the Heb. of

¹⁾ This expression occurs in addition to Zeph 3: 14 and Zech 9: 9 only in Zech 2: 10 in the O. T., to the best of my knowledge.

²⁾ Verbs of not fearing and rejoicing (singing, joy, gladness) are parallel also in Is 35: 1-10; 41: 10-16. Note also, "Fear not . . . I bring good news of great joy" in Lk 2: 10.

³⁾ See here Justin, *Dial.* 53: 3; Clement of Alex., *Paed.* 1: 5. Cf. Allegro, *op. cit.*, p. 175 and n. 13; Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 119 and n. 3.

⁴⁾ Bernard, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 425.

⁵⁾ Cf., e.g., Dodd, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (1956), *passim*.

⁶⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 119; for references cf. Str.-B., 1, pp. 842-844.

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 348.

⁸⁾ This seems to me the best explanation of Mt's form of the quotation since his differences from the MT may well be explained as lapse of memory. The fact that the inclusion of the words "just and saving" "constitute the very epitome of Matthew's Christology" (Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 119—contrast his view), and his use of the word "meek" instead of the Rabbinic "poor" lend support to the theory of memory. Torrey says the citation in Mt was from memory (*Documents*, p. 76).

Zeph 3: 14 ff., the most likely O. T. source for that part of the quotation, unless Jn intentionally changed "rejoice" of Zech to "do not fear." Of καθ. . . . ὄνου Barrett says: "Here again John may be quoting carelessly; or perhaps he was aware of the misunderstanding which the Hebrew parallelism invited (and may have caused in Matthew) and re-wrote the difficult words simply and clearly, caring more for the sense than for verbal accuracy." ¹⁾

In contrast to the view of Barrett, I believe the quotation in Jn 12: 15 is a free artistic composition on the basis of Mt to give added strength to the writer's theme of Jesus as king. Several reasons for this view follow.

Apart from the quotation itself, but bearing directly upon it, there is the fact that in Jn the elements of an actual procession in the Synoptics are omitted. In Mk and Mt the crowd went before and followed after Jesus, and Lk adds "as he rode along." In Jn the "great crowd," already in Jerusalem, went out to meet Jesus and simply took branches of palm trees and shouted. In Jn there is no spreading of garments and branches on the road. Jn clearly thinks that Jesus' mere sitting on the ass fulfills the prophecy of his kingship: "He sat on it, as it is written" (vs. 14). This factor alone is enough to account for the use of the word καθήμενος in the quotation. Jn had just used καθίζω in the previous vs. Since Jesus "sat" (ἐκάθισεν) on the ass—and since there is no effort to convey the idea of a procession—to be consistent Jn must use "sitting" instead of "riding" or "mounted." He had no other choice for a passive of καθίζω. κάθημαι following after καθίζω gave him sufficient variation of style and balance as with ὄνος following after ὄναριον. καθίζω itself, then, appears to have been borrowed by Jn from the account of Mt 21: 7.²⁾ Jn uses καθίζω at only one other place (19: 13).

The words ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου now become more intelligible as a condensation of Mt. Only Mt uses πῶλος and ὄνος together (twice, 21: 2, 5). Jn retains ὄνος intentionally here to give variation and balance to ὄναριον used in the preceding vs. The line ἰδοὺ . . . ἔρχεται is retained, as in Mt, except for the omission of σοι, perhaps for metrical reasons. This line is the whole basis for Jn's use of the quotation in the first place. The word "meek," like σοι, may be omitted for the sake of meter³⁾ or, rather, because it added nothing to—even detracted from—the theme of Jesus as king.

Finally, one bit of interesting literary evidence apart from the quota-

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 349.

²⁾ Or perhaps from Mk 11: 7 where the words ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτόν are close to Jn's ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτό. Contrast Lk 19: 35.

³⁾ Cf. Torrey, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 275 f.

tions themselves but bearing directly upon my point of literary dependence of Jn upon the Synoptics. I call attention to Jn's use of the word *ἄλλος*. Jn always uses the word alone, without a modifier (5: 13; 6: 22, 24; 7: 12, 20, 31 f., 40, 43, 49; 11: 42; 12: 17, 18, 29, 34) except when he follows the Synoptics. Then he varies his usage. In the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand Mk 6: 34 and Mt 14: 14 have *πολὺν ἄλλον*, but other places in the narrative *ἄλλος* is used alone. (Mk uses the word only once; Mt 14: 13, 15, 19; Lk 9: 11, 12, 16) Here Jn does not use *ἄλλος* alone but varies between *ἄλλος πολὺς* (6: 2) and *πολὺς ἄλλος* (6: 5). Note also that the "grass" in Mt 14: 19 and "the green grass" in Mk 6: 39 become in Jn "much grass" (*χόρτος πολὺς*, 6: 10). In the same way, in the context of our quotations, the words "the crowd" in Mt 21: 8 and "the crowds" in Mt 21: 9—the word "crowd" does not occur in the narratives of Mk and Lk here—become in Jn 12: 9, 12 "the great crowd" (*ὁ ἄλλος πολὺς*). This evidence appears to me too obvious to be accidental and strengthens my view that Jn shows literary dependence upon the Synoptics for the passages under consideration.

It is clear that for the quotation from Zech Jn has more in common with the Synoptics, especially Mt, than with the Heb. or Gr. O. T. Evidence has been given for considering the whole section in 12: 12-19 as a creative composition from elements of the Synoptics inserted into the Lazarus episode to give support to the theme of Jesus' kingship. That this point of view is the author's own theology is the only plausible way of explaining his comments in vs. 16: "These things his disciples did not understand at first, but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written about him and done to him." It is significant for our argument also that the only times Jn uses words about the disciples remembering (2: 17, 22 and 12: 16) are in instances which in the Synoptic accounts are connected with the entry into Jerusalem.

With the comment about the disciples remembering (vs. 16) Jn reveals another point in his theology, namely, that Jesus' "glorification" was necessary to a full understanding of him. At the same time, Jn reveals, perhaps unconsciously, an earlier tradition that the first followers of Jesus did not understand him in the same way later ones did. If the view of Jn that Jesus' disciples did not understand him as *King* is historical, it is unlikely that the crowd would have done so. If the Synoptic account of the entry into Jerusalem is historical, then the conflict with Jn on this point is irreconcilable. On the other hand, Jn's statement about the disciples' failure to understand Jesus may be a reflection of his own theological view with respect to the "glorification" of Jesus.

CHAPTER NINE

THE UNBELIEF OF THE MULTITUDE

Jn 12:38-40

Texts

Jn 12:38

ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἑσαίου τοῦ προφήτου
πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν· κύριε, τίς
ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;
καὶ ὁ βραχίον κυρίου τίνοι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

Rom 10:16

Ἑσαῖας γὰρ λέγει· κύριε, τίς
ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;

Is 53:1 (LXX B)

κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;
καὶ ὁ βραχίον κυρίου τίνοι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

Is 53:1 (MT)

מִי אֶמְאֵן יְיָ
וְיִהְיֶה עַל-מִי לְחַיָּה

Jn 12:39 f.

πάλιν εἶπεν Ἑσαῖας· τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν
αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ
καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Mt 13:14 f.

ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἑσαίου ἢ λέγουσα·
ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε,
καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε.
ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,
καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν,
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν·
μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν
καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν,
καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Acts 28:26 f.

πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπὸν·
ἀκοῇ το αὐτούς exactly as in Mt 13:14 f.

Mk 4: 12

ἵνα

βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν,
καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν,
μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

Mt 13: 13

ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες
οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνιοῦσιν.

Lk 8: 10

ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

Is 6: 9 f. (LXX B)

πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὸν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ· ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε
καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ
ἴδητε. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ
τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
ἐκάμμυσαν, μὴ ποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς
ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ
ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἴάσομαι αὐτούς.

Is 6: 9 f. (MT)

לך ואמרת לעם הזה שמעו שמעו ואל-תבינו וראו ראו
ואל-תדעו השמן לב-העם הזה ואזניו הכבד ועיניו השע
פן-יראה בעיניו ובאזניו ישמע ולבבו יכבד ורפא לו

Is 6: 9 f. (Targ. Jon.)

... דשמעין משמע ולא מסתכלין וחזן מחזא ולא ידעין
... דלמא ... ויתובין וישתביק להן

Jn explains the unbelief of the multitude as the fulfillment of two prophecies from Isaiah. In the first quotation the part from κύριε τοῖς ἡμῶν is cited by Paul in Rom 10: 16 as in Jn. The formula of introduction, ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν, occurs nowhere else. (ὁ) λόγος as part of a formula is used by Jn only here and in 15: 25 and in the N. T. elsewhere only in Lk 3: 4 (in pl.).¹⁾ πληρώω as part of a

¹⁾ Cf. Acts 15: 15; Rev 1: 3; 22: 7, 9, 10, 18 f.
Suppl. to Novum Test., XI

(signs, vs. 37) of Jesus, so he quotes the whole vs. Accordingly, the ἀκοή was thought of as indicative of the words and the βραχίων of the deeds of Jesus.¹⁾ Jn found the passage from Is suitable for his theological purpose and used it as it was in its LXX form.

The second quotation (12: 40) dealing with the unbelief of the multitude follows after the one in 12: 38 except for a connecting sentence which becomes a sort of introductory formula to it. The actual formula is probably only "again Isaiah said," and it occurs nowhere else exactly as here. The closest formula is "and Isaiah says" in Rom 15: 12. Cf. "and again another scripture says" in Jn 19: 37.²⁾ The passage from Is 6: 9 f. is cited also in Mt 13: 14 f. and Acts 28: 26 f. and is alluded to or quoted loosely in Mk 4: 12; Mt 13: 13; and Lk 8: 10.

Is 6: 9 f. is obviously the direct source, but it is not certain whether Jn used the Heb. or Gr. text. Even the opinions of the Hebraists and/or Aramaists are divided. Torrey³⁾ says, "Influence of the LXX is plainly to be seen in 12: 38 and 40." Burney⁴⁾ agrees that the text of 12: 38 "is influenced by LXX," but of 12: 40 he says that Jn "is clearly independent of LXX." Pointing out the differences between Jn and LXX, he says that Jn is not, however, a free reminiscence of the Heb., "as might be supposed from the fact that the writer uses past tenses . . . while the Hebrew appears to use Imperatives . . . הִשְׁמַן, הִשְׁחָךְ are either treated as Infinitives Absolute in place of Perfects—'blinding' . . . 'making gross,' standing for 'He hath blinded,' 'hath made gross' (a normal and idiomatic usage); or the forms are read as Perfects, הִשְׁמַן, הִשְׁחָךְ, as they might naturally be read in the unvocalized text. Thus (allowing for omission of the reference to ears, and the transposition of a clause) Jn's reading is a reasonably accurate rendering of Heb., and is nearer to it than LXX in reading sing. τετόφλωκεν in place of plur. ἐκάμυσαν which makes the people the subject."

Bultmann⁵⁾ says that the quotations in 12: 38 and 12: 40 can hardly be written by one hand because the former is quoted literally according

¹⁾ Bultmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 346 and 347, n. 1) says that for the evangelist the conceptions σημεία and ῥήματα (λόγοι) are fused; the σημεία are expressive (*redende*) deeds; their meaning is developed in the speaking. The βραχίων characterizes the *Predigt* as divine deed (*Tat*). In the O. T. the "arm of the Lord" is sometimes symbolic of his power: Dt 5: 15; Is 40: 10; 51: 9; 52: 10; 63: 5; cf. Lk 1: 51; Acts 13: 17.

²⁾ For similar words of introduction cf. Mt 15: 4, 7; 19: 5, 18; 22: 24; Mk 7: 10; Rom 10: 16; Acts 2: 25.

³⁾ *The Four Gospels*, p. 280.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 120 ff.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 346, n. 4.

to the LXX while the latter does not use the LXX. He then argues that vss. 39 ff. with 42 f. go back to the evangelist and that vss. 37 f. must have been taken by him from his source.¹⁾ Bultmann leaves the matter of text undecided: "Whether the evangelist has taken his text from a translation before him or formed it himself, is hardly possible to tell."²⁾ Hoskyns³⁾ says that the LXX version "seems to form the background of the Johannine citation, since the words *and I should heal them* belong to the LXX and not to the Hebrew text." On the other hand, Barrett,⁴⁾ recognizing the difference between Heb., LXX, and Jn, concludes that "John seems to be nearer to the Hebrew than to the LXX."

In Mk, Mt, and Lk the quotation from Is 6: 9 f. is put on the lips of Jesus in reply to the disciples who ask him about his parables. "To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside everything is in parables," *ὅτι*, etc.⁵⁾ Textually, Mk, especially the last line, seems to be an allusion to the Is text with strong affinities to the Targum.⁶⁾ Mt 13: 13 is even more of an allusion to the Is passage. Mt's use of *ὅτι* avoids the *ὅτι* of Mk and Lk, or perhaps interprets it by changing Mk's subjunctives to indicatives,⁷⁾ which makes the people themselves responsible for their blindness and lack of understanding. This is in keeping with the more usual point of view of the O. T. and Scrolls.⁸⁾

The long quotation from Is 6: 9 f. in Mt 13: 14 f. is exactly like the

¹⁾ Bultmann's complicated theory of sources need not concern us; however, he rightly argues (against Faure, *ZNTW* 21 (1922), 103 f.) that the difference in introductory formulas for the two quotations is no criterion for different sources since "the evangelist" also uses *ὅτι* *πληρ.* in 13: 18; 15: 25; 17: 12.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 347, n. 2. So apparently Stendahl (*op. cit.*, p. 131); perhaps also Bernard, though he seems to favor the Heb. (*op. cit.*, 2, p. 450).

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 428 f.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 359.

⁵⁾ On the problem of language cf. Torrey, *The Four Gospels*, p. 299; *Our Translated Gospels*, pp. 10 f.; M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (1954), pp. 153-156. Contrast Colwell, *op. cit.*, *passim*. On the problem of interpretation cf. W. Manson, "The Purpose of the Parables: A Re-Examination of St. Mark iv. 10-12" in *ET* 68 (1957), pp. 132-135; J. A. Baird, "A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New Evidence on Mark 4: 11, 33-34" in *JBL* 76 (1957), pp. 201-207. The linguistic origin of *ὅτι* and the interpretation of the Marcan saying are subjects which lie beyond the scope of this work.

⁶⁾ See M. Black, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

⁷⁾ Cf. McNeile, *op. cit.*, p. 190; Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

⁸⁾ Cf., e.g., Dt 32: 15; Is 42: 18-25; Jer 5: 21; 7: 24-26; 11: 7 f.; 17: 22 f.; 25: 4; Ezek 12: 2 f.; Hab 1: 4 f.; Num 15: 39; Ezek 6: 9; contrast Dt 29: 4; Is 29: 10; 43: 8 ff.; 44: 18; Wis 2: 21. In Scrolls cf. CD 3: 5, 11; 19: 20; 2: 14-21; 1QS 1: 2-9; 2: 26; 5: 3-5; 1QpHab 5: 7; 1QH 7: 2 f.; *et al.* Cf. in N. T. Mk 4: 23 ff.; 8: 17 f.; Lk 8: 18; 10: 23 f.; Rom 11: 8.

LXX B except that Mt retains ἀντὼν after ὀφθαλμούς with **NAQ** and omits it before βάρως with **N***. Torrey says that the quotation in Mt is an interpolation from Acts 28: 26 f.¹⁾ Black, on the other hand, says: "The quotation . . . is so characteristic of Matthew, when he has the opportunity of introducing an Old Testament passage, that the whole verse from LXX Isaiah is probably Matthew's own expansion of the original saying."²⁾

Lk 8: 10 is closer to Mk than to Mt and is also an allusion rather than direct quotation. Black suggests that the shorter form of Mt and Lk may be original "and the quotation as cited by Jesus have stopped at συνίωσιν."³⁾ However, the affinities of Mk with the Targum would tend to indicate a Palestinian origin of the saying and support its authenticity.

In Acts 28: 26 f. the quotation is put in the mouth of Paul who directs it to the Jews at Rome who could not agree among themselves. The introductory formula is: "Well spoke the holy spirit through Isaiah the prophet to your fathers, saying." The text is exactly the same as that in Mt, but Acts adds an extra line at the beginning from Is 6: 9. The word order of this line differs from the MT and LXX; πρὸς with the acc. in Acts may be from the Heb. לעם, etc.

The quotation in Jn differs from MT, LXX, and Synoptics. The purpose of the quotation in Jn is the same as that in Mt—to show that the Jews' refusal to accept Jesus was the fulfillment of prophecy. Burney may be right about the Heb. verbs, and Jn may be a reasonably accurate rendering of the Heb. But Jn's theological view is responsible for making God the subject in Is (or probably Jesus in Jn), so a sing. verb in past tense and active voice is required.⁴⁾ Jn's verbs τυφλόω and παρώω are rare in the LXX.⁵⁾ But τυφ. is used twice in contexts similar to that of Is 6: 9 f. and our quotation. Wis 2: 21: "For their evil has blinded them, and they did not know his [God's] secret purposes (μυστήρια)." Note especially Is 42: 18-20, though here the servant is blind.⁶⁾ In

¹⁾ Cf. *Our Translated Gospels*, p. 11 and *Documents*, p. 67. On this point, with respect to formula, etc. cf. Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

²⁾ M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1954), p. 157. Quoted by permission.

³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁴⁾ ἐπὶ. **N** Wpc "is an attempt to find a somewhat more suitable verb"; πεπώρ. **Sp**m, "to find a more suitable tense, and to assimilate to τετύφλωκεν" (Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 360).

⁵⁾ The former only in Tob 7: 7; Wis 2: 21; Is 42: 19; the latter only in Job 17: 7 and Prov 10: 20 where it translates כהה. Jn himself uses τυφλόω, παρώω, and νοέω only in this quotation, but τυφλόω occurs in 1 Jn 2: 11.

⁶⁾ Here τυφ. translates עִוֵּר.

Job 17: 7 Job says: πεπώρωνται γὰρ (הִכְתִּין) ἀπὸ ὀργῆς οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου. Perhaps Jn's vocabulary again shows influence from the wisdom writings. The Heb. and Gr. verbs שָׁמַן, שָׁעַן and παχύνω, καμμύω are themselves rare in the O. T.; and the Gr. verbs in the LXX always translate a different Heb. word or voice.¹⁾

Jn's omission of the phrases with reference to ears and hearing differs from MT, LXX, and Mt-Acts and is intentional since he has just spoken about the signs Jesus had done in the sight of the Jews (vs. 37). "Their eyes" in Jn could come from either MT, LXX, or Mt-Acts, and "their heart" may be an abbreviation of "the heart of this people" from either text also. ἵνα μή in Jn may be used to translate כִּן of the MT or for the μή ποτε of the LXX.²⁾ The remainder of the quotation may be a satisfactory translation of the MT; but of the last twelve words in Jn ten are in exactly the same form as words in the LXX.³⁾

In view of the evidence, we conclude that the theological view of Jn is responsible for his form of the quotation from Is 6: 9 f. The unbelief of the multitude is explained as predestined by God and fulfills what Jn believed had been prophesied concerning Jesus. This is clear from vs. 39, the theological link between the two quotations dealing with the unbelief of the multitude: "For this reason they could not believe, because again Isaiah said. . ."

¹⁾ שָׁמַן, Qal occurs only in Dt 32: 15 (2); Jer 5: 28; Hi. in Is 6: 10; Neh 9: 25. שָׁעַן, Qal occurs only in Is 29: 9; 32: 3; Hi. in Is 6: 10; Hithpa. in Is 29: 9. παχύνω occurs only in Dt 32: 15 for שָׁמַן in Qal and עָבַהּ; 2 Sam 22: 12 (word not in Heb.); Ecc 12: 5 for סָבַל in Hithpa.; Is 6: 10 for שָׁמַן in Hi.; 34: 6 for דָּשַׁן in Hithpa. καμμύω occurs only in Is 6: 10 for שָׁעַן in Hi.; 29: 10 for עָצַם in Pi.; 33: 15 for עָצַם in Qal; Lam 3: 45 (word not in Heb.).

²⁾ Bernard's statement that Jn "never uses μή ποτε" (*op. cit.*, 2, p. 450) is not entirely accurate. Jn does use the words in 7: 26 but, it is true, in a different sense. Against the argument of Burney that Jn's Gr. here is from the Aramaic (*op. cit.*, p. 100) cf. Colwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 94 f.

³⁾ νοέω of Jn and συνίημι of LXX both translate the Heb. בִּין in Qal or Hi., but the latter does so about 58 times as against about 12 times for the former.

CHAPTER TEN

THE TRAITOR

Jn 13:18

Texts

Jn 13:18

ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ· ὁ τρώγων μου
τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμέ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

Mk 14:18, 21

ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ . . . ὅτι
ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται
περὶ αὐτοῦ·

Mt 26:21, 24

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν εἶπεν . . .
ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει
καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Lk 22:22

ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον πορεύεται.

Ps 41:10 (LXX B)

ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου,
ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμέ πτερνισμόν.

Ps 41:10 (MT)

אוכל לחמי
הגדיל עלי עקב

1 QH 5:33, 35

ואוכלה בלחם אנחה
ויהפך לי ל[חמ]י לריב

1 QH 5:24

אוכלי לחמי
עלי הגדילו עקב

In 13:18 and 15:25 occur the only two quotations of fulfillment on the lips of Jesus in Jn,¹⁾ the former dealing with Judas the traitor and the latter with hatred for Jesus without cause. The formulas of introduction are very different. In 13:18 the formula is simply (ἀλλ') ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ²⁾ and occurs also in Jn 17:12 and 19:24 but nowhere else in the N. T. The formula closest to it is the most usual one in Mt, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν δια.³⁾ The quotation in 13:18 occurs nowhere else in the N. T., but its source, Ps 41:10, may be alluded to in Mk 14:18.

Jn may be closer to the MT than to the LXX. Torrey and Black do not

¹⁾ Others indicating fulfillment are 12:38; 19:24; 19:36; cf. 19:28. Others in the words of Jesus are 6:45; 7:38; 10:34.

²⁾ Contrast 15:25 where the formula is much longer than the quotation.

³⁾ Cf., e.g., 4:14; 12:17; 21:4; cf. Mk 15:28 and Ja 2:23.

discuss this passage, but Burney says: "Jn. renders Heb. accurately, and is independent of LXX." ¹⁾ Bultmann says that the quotation does not stem from the LXX. ²⁾ Barrett says: "On the whole John is nearer to the Hebrew . . . than to the LXX . . . though he departs from the Hebrew where the LXX renders it literally (ἐμεγάλυνεν for יהגדיל)." ³⁾ Stendahl lists Jn 13: 18 with 12: 40 and 19: 37 as showing "the greatest deviations from the LXX." ⁴⁾

Ps 41: 10 is quoted loosely in the Qumran Hymns 5, line 24, where the sentence is put in the plural. Cf. also line 35: "And my bread has turned for me into adversity." ⁵⁾

In Mk 14: 18 the words "the one who is eating with me" are regarded as a direct quotation by Nestle who prints them in heavy type. ⁶⁾ But the words are at most an allusion, not direct quotation. Yet the author may have had the Ps passage in mind since he says in vs. 21, "The son of man goes as it is written of him," where no reference to the O. T. is given. For vs. 21, however, and its parallel in Mt 26: 24 commentators generally suggest other O. T. passages. ⁷⁾ Lk, perhaps realizing the difficulty, writes κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον for καθὼς γέγραπται. In Mk 4: 17-21 = Mt 26: 20-25 = Lk 22: 14, 21-23 the writers apparently believed that the actual betrayer was not revealed, in spite of Mk 14: 20 and parallels. Perhaps "the designation points out not the traitor, but the treachery of the act." ⁸⁾

Jn, like the Synoptists, puts Jesus' prophecy about the traitor at the time of the supper, and like them he retains the element of the disciples' uncertainty about whom Jesus spoke (13: 22). But unlike the Synoptists, he does not leave the figure of the betrayer in doubt. Jesus himself takes the morsel and "gives it to Judas" (vs. 26). And unlike the Synoptists, with the possible exception of Mk, Jn introduces a quotation to show that the betrayal by Judas was prophesied in the scripture.

With respect to ἵνα, etc. in the introductory formula Bultmann would render, "but the scripture must be fulfilled." ⁹⁾ Barrett calls this use of

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 121. So Bernard, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 467.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 364, n. 10. So also Hoskyns, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 370 f.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 163.

⁵⁾ Texts and translation taken from J. Baumgarten and M. Mansoor, "Studies in the New *Hodayot* (Thanksgiving Hymns)—III" in *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 107-113.

⁶⁾ So also W. and H.; cf. F. C. Grant who says the words are "the words of Ps 41: 9" (*The Gospel of Mark* (1952), p. 64.).

⁷⁾ Cf. Gould, *op. cit.*, p. 263; Grant, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 45; McNeile, *op. cit.*, pp. 380f.

⁸⁾ Gould, *op. cit.*, p. 262; so McNeile, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

⁹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 364, n. 9.

ἵνα with the subj. as a substitute for the imperative a "less probable" alternative to "but I have chosen him [Judas] in order that . . ." ¹⁾

For the quotation it seems impossible to tell whether Jn was consciously rendering either the Heb. or Gr. text. The words ὁ τρώγων . . . ἄρτον are a more literal rendering of the Heb. than the LXX with its pl. ἄρτους. Here Sym., like Jn, reads sing. ἄρτον but differs otherwise: συνεσθίων μοι ἄρτον ἐμόν. While τρώγω is never used in the LXX, it "was displacing ἐσθίω in ordinary use." ²⁾ Jn uses both ἐσθίω and τρώγω; ³⁾ but with the exception of Mt 24: 38, the latter occurs nowhere else in the N. T. The variant μετ' ἐμοῦ may be made under the influence of Mk 14: 18 and Lk 22: 21; but since μετ' ἐμοῦ is also the reading of P⁶⁶, ⁴⁾ μου may be an assimilation to the LXX. μετ' ἐμοῦ suits the context perfectly since Judas is at present eating with Jesus; for this reason it may be the original reading. ἐπῆρεν of Jn is a departure from both MT and LXX where the LXX renders the Heb. literally. In the LXX ἐπαίρω nowhere translates גָּדַל. The tense itself may be from either Heb. or Gr. ἐπ' ἐμέ is exactly the LXX which is a literal translation of the Heb. τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ is not an exact rendering of the Heb. or Gr. since τὴν and αὐτοῦ are in neither text. Here the LXX is a more literal translation of the Heb. than Jn, but the form πτερνισμός occurs elsewhere in the LXX only in 2 Kgs 10: 19 where it renders עֲקֵבָה. πτέρνα except in Ps 41: 10 always translates עֲקֵב ⁵⁾ and once עֲקֵב (Jer 9: 4). Ag. and Th., like Jn, have πτέρνα but differ otherwise: κατεμεγάλυνθη μου πτέρνα. While Jn's πτέρνα is a translation of the Heb., it is at the same time in accord with the usage of the LXX. We cannot arrive at a dogmatic conclusion about the textual source of Jn's quotation. There may be a slight edge for the Heb. for about half the quotation.

Whereas in the Synoptics the point of the context may be "the treachery of the act," in Jn the emphasis is clearly on Judas the betrayer. The quotation is undoubtedly meant to be applied to him. Even the context of the Ps fits the context of Jn. Judas is present at the supper with

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 370. For the imperative use cf. Moulton, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 178 f., 248.

²⁾ A. Souter, *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* (1943), p. 265. It occurs in the papyri; cf. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (1949), p. 644.

³⁾ Four times, in 6: 54, 56, 57, 58, of eating Jesus' flesh and the bread from heaven; we might expect Jn to use it here.

⁴⁾ Now one of the earliest important mss. of Jn and which M. E. Boismard dates between 170-230; cf. "Le Papyrus Bodmer II" in *Revue Biblique*, 74 (1957), p. 364. Reading also of $\aleph^a$ D^o pl.

⁵⁾ Gen 3: 15; 25: 26; 49: 17; Josh 23: 13; Jud 5: 22; Ps 48: 5; 55: 6; Song 1: 8; Jer 13: 22.

Jesus, but as his intimate or loyal friend ¹⁾ has already been predestined to betray Jesus (13: 2).²⁾ The whole quotation appears to be a free adaptation, perhaps from memory, to suit the immediate context.

There may be another motive, in addition to the one naturally provided by the context, for Jn's use of a quotation. The underlying motive probably was to supplement the story of the traitor as told by the Synoptists, especially Mk and Mt. The words of Mk 14: 21 and Mt 26: 24, καὶ ὡς γέγραπται, without a subsequent quotation, provided the necessary incentive for a quotation in Jn's account. Lk's change to κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον already seems to be an effort to reconcile the difficulty. Jn has gone even further by supplying an actual quotation. His broad familiarity with the O. T. made the task of finding one relatively easy.³⁾

If the words ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ in Mk 14: 18 are to be taken as a direct quotation, or even an allusion, then this fact may only have given added incentive to Jn to supplement the quotation with reference to such an important point. The words μετ' ἐμοῦ, present in P⁶⁶, add weight to the theory of influence from Mk. The fact that in the N. T. Ps 41 is nowhere else quoted with reference either to Judas or Jesus, and apparently was not even regarded as messianic,⁴⁾ adds further support to our argument. Like the theme of Jesus' kingship, which is given a much more prominent place in Jn's gospel than in the Synoptics, the theme of Judas the betrayer is made more prominent in Jn. In the Synoptics Judas

¹⁾ Bernard says: "To eat bread at the table of a superior was to offer a pledge of loyalty (2 Sam 9: 7, 14; 1 Kgs 18: 19; 2 Kgs 25: 29); and to betray one with whom bread had been eaten, one's 'messmate,' was a gross breach of the traditions of hospitality" (*op. cit.*, 2, p. 467). This is the meaning of the passage in the Ps. Perhaps in Jn the "one who eats my bread" is "the one who is my pupil." So the Rabbis in applying Ps 41: 10 to Ahithophel and David; cf. Str.-B., 2, pp. 558 f.; also A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes* (1948), p. 285.

²⁾ The fact that in 13: 27 Satan entered Judas "after the morsel" conflicts with 13: 2 is one of those enigmatic contradictions inherent in the method of Jn which cannot be explained.

³⁾ I am aware of the fact that Jn may have had another source or tradition in addition to the Synoptics for the passion narrative since his narrative differs somewhat from that of the Synoptics. In spite of the difference on such an important matter as chronology, I believe it can be shown that Jn did not have a separate source or tradition for the passion narrative and that his differences are mostly due to his creative use of his Synoptic sources and his own theological interpretation. But this is a subject beyond the scope of this work. Cf. the excellent treatment by Dodd, who seems to argue for another tradition (*op. cit.*, pp. 423-443).

⁴⁾ On lack of evidence from Str.-B. who apparently do not regard Ps 41: 10 as a quotation in Mk 14: 18 since they do not discuss the passage there but under Jn 13: 18. And neither Mowinckel (*op. cit.*) nor Helmer Ringgren (*The Messiah in the Old Testament* (1956) refers to Ps 41.

is not mentioned before the sections dealing with his betrayal except in the lists of the disciples. But early in Jn Jesus is revealed as being aware of Judas' future betrayal, and the reader becomes aware¹⁾ of it at the same time (6: 64, 70 f.). In the story of the anointing Judas asks the question about selling the ointment (12: 4-6). In the supper story Jesus leaves no doubt about his betrayer, giving the morsel to Judas (13: 26). Judas is custodian of the money box for the disciples (12: 6; 13: 29). Cf. further 13: 2, 10 f., 21; 17: 12. Jn has all these references to Judas in addition to the ones dealing with the actual betrayal. Even Jn's narrative of the betrayal is presented in a manner different from the Synoptics. It is presented in such a way that Judas is given a much more theological role. I mention only one feature in Jn's presentation: Judas does not actually openly betray Jesus, as he does in the Synoptics, "in order to fulfill the word which Jesus had spoken, 'Of those whom thou gavest me I lost not one' " (18: 9). Contrast 19: 11, and cf. further 18: 2, 3, 5.

In the context of our quotation Judas as the revealed betrayer of Jesus is made the transition point between the already existing,²⁾ while at the same time still anticipated,³⁾ glorification of Jesus and his future further glorification and exaltation⁴⁾ through his death and resurrection. "So, having received the morsel, Judas went out immediately; and it was night. When he had gone out, Jesus said, 'Now is the son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him; if God is glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself and will glorify him at once' " (13: 30 f.).⁵⁾

¹⁾ This is in keeping with Jn's increased emphasis upon Jesus' attribute of foreknowledge; cf., e.g., Jn 2: 24 f.; 4: 1; 5: 6; 5: 42, 61, 64; 13: 1, 11; 16: 19; 18: 4.

²⁾ Through his works: 2: 11; 11: 4; 12: 23. Otherwise cf. 12: 28; 13: 31 f.; 17: 22.

³⁾ Cf. 3: 14; 7: 39; 8: 28, 50; 12: 28, 31 f., 34.

⁴⁾ Cf. 12: 16, 28; 14: 13 with passages listed in previous note; and cf. also 17: 1, 5, 10.

⁵⁾ It is almost impossible to explain Jn's artistic development of his theme of Jesus' "glorification" and Judas' part in its dramatic presentation. On 13: 30 f. cf. the comments by Bultmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 368-371 and footnotes; 401 f. and notes), and Barrett (*op. cit.*, pp. 374 f.), and Dodd (*op. cit.*, pp. 396, 402 ff., 407, 409 f., 417). Cf. also Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 121 f.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

HATRED WITHOUT CAUSE

Jn 15:25

Texts

Jn 15:25

ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν
γεγραμμένος ὅτι ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν.

Pss 35: 19 and 69: 5 (LXX B)

οἱ μισοῦντές με δωρεάν

Pss 35: 19 and 69: 5 (MT)

שנאי חנם

Ps 119: 161 (LXX B)

ἄρχοντες κατεδίωξάν με δωρεάν

Ps 119: 161 (MT)

שרים רדפוני חנם

Ps Sol 7: 1

οἱ ἐμίσησαν ἡμᾶς δωρεάν

The second quotation of fulfillment on the lips of Jesus, the last one spoken by him, is given to explain the hatred the world has for Jesus. The formula of introduction is the longest in Jn and probably the longest in the N. T.¹⁾ and occurs nowhere else.²⁾ Apparently the formula, "that the word written in their law might be fulfilled," is synonymous for the words, "that the scripture might be fulfilled," used by Jesus in 13: 18. ὁ λόγος as the equivalent of ἡ γραφή for a quotation from the O. T. with the idea of fulfillment is used also in Jn 12: 38 but nowhere else in the N. T.³⁾ Note that ὁ λόγος, used with reference to a statement of Jesus, has fulfillment in Jn 18: 9, 32. νόμος here, as in 10: 34, is used for "law" in the broad sense.⁴⁾ ὅτι, as in 10: 34, is thought of as introducing direct speech. The words of Pss 35: 19 and

¹⁾ Cf., e.g., Mt 1: 22; 2: 15; 3: 3; 21: 4; Acts 4: 25; 28: 26; Rom 4: 6.

²⁾ Barrett says that ἀλλ' . . . πληρ. is either "elliptic ('These things are so happening in order that the word may be fulfilled') or ἵνα with the subjunctive is used imperatively ('But let the word be fulfilled' . . .)." He prefers the ellipsis (*op. cit.*, p. 402). So Bernard and Bultmann.

³⁾ Cf. Gal 5: 14; Col 1: 25. In a formula the closest is Mt's τὸ ῥηθέν; cf. Lk 3: 4; Acts 15: 15; 1 Cor 15: 54.

⁴⁾ For Jesus' attitude toward the law in Jn see comments under 10: 34 above.

69: 5 quoted here are not quoted or alluded to anywhere else in the N. T.

Commentators generally, with W. and H. and Nestle, regard Ps 35: 19 or 69: 5 as the source of this quotation. If they are correct, then it is impossible to tell whether it is from the Heb. or Gr. text since the LXX translates the MT literally and Jn agrees with neither. The verb in Jn is closer to Ps Sol 7: 1, but Jn has $\mu\epsilon$ instead of $\eta\mu\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$. Cf. also Ps 119: 161.

With respect to the text, about all one can say is that it is, in the words of Burney, "a free reminiscence"¹⁾ of some passage such as Ps 35: 19 or 69: 5 or, perhaps, Ps 119: 161 or Ps Sol 7: 1. Bernard regards Ps 69: 5 as the most probable source since it was regarded as a messianic psalm.²⁾ I might add that in the next line of Ps 69 in the LXX the psalmist speaks of enemies persecuting ($\epsilon\kappa\delta\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\nu\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$; $\delta\iota\omega\kappa.$ א) him. So also Ps 119: 157, 161. Since in Jn 15: 20 Jesus speaks about himself and his disciples being persecuted, perhaps the writer (or Jesus) had in mind Ps 69 or a combination of several passages. In these psalms the psalmists are describing their enemies who hate and persecute them without cause. In Jn Jesus is said to apply the words of the psalmist(s) to the Jews in such a way as to show that his persecution and hatred by the Jews without cause had been prophesied in their own law. Bultmann³⁾ conveys the mood of the quotation and context exactly: $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ not *gratis* (Mt 10: 8; Rom 3: 24) nor *frustra* (Gal 2: 21) but *immerito* ($\alpha\mu\eta\grave{\nu}$; Targ. סנאי מן = "meine Hasser aus nichtigem Grund").⁴⁾

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2, p. 495. It is true that Ps 69 is frequently quoted or alluded to in the N. T. Cf. Mk 15: 36 = Mt 27: 48; Mt 27: 34 = Lk 23: 36; Jn 2: 17; Rom 11: 9f; 15: 3; Heb 11: 26; Rev 3: 5; 13: 8; 16: 1; 17: 8.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 424, n. 9; 425, n. 1.

⁴⁾ So Str.-B., 2, p. 565.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE SON OF PERDITION

Jn 17: 12

Texts

Jn 17: 12

καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ ὁ
υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ.

Prov 24: 22a (LXX B)

λόγον φυλασσόμενος υἱὸς ἀπωλείας ἐκτὸς ἔσται

In my discussion of the use of ἡ γραφή under Jn 7: 42 I suggested that here in 17: 12 it might not refer to O. T. scripture but rather to the words of Jesus himself formerly spoken in 6: 70 f. and now having fulfillment. In 18: 9 the word which Jesus had spoken here in 17: 12 has its fulfillment. Consequently I do not consider Jn 17: 12 a quotation in the usual sense. However, I am aware of other possible views, and they are now mentioned.

ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας may be an allusion to some O. T. passage such as Is 57: 4¹) (עֲשׂוּ־יִדְלִי, τέκνα ἀπωλείας). Cf. also Is 34: 5 (LXX): ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας μετὰ κρίσεως, an eschatological passage. There is the view, given by Barrett, for example, that by ἵνα . . . πληρ. is meant “probably the γραφή (Ps 41: 10) quoted in 13: 18 rather than any prediction of Antichrist.”²) The words ἵνα, etc. may be a “gloss or comment added by the evangelist or an early editor.”³) Bultmann seems to combine views—if I interpret him correctly. He says that “in your name” and “that the scripture may be fulfilled” stem from the evangelist but that “except the son of perdition” was probably in the source.

¹) So the margin of Nestle which also lists Ps 41: 10 and 109: 8, but no words are in heavy type. W. and H. do not print any words in large type nor do they list Jn 17: 12 as a quotation. Hoskyns points to Ps 41: 8; 109: 8 (*op. cit.*, p. 501).

²) *Op. cit.*, p. 425. So F. C. Grant, *The Gospel of John*, 2 (1956), p. 24 and Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 322. Str.-B. do not deal with this passage.

³) So Bernard, who goes on to say that ἡ γραφή in Jn always refers to a definite O. T. passage (cf. my comments under Jn 7: 42 above) and that Ps 41: 9, cited in 13: 18, was probably meant here even though Pss 69: 25 and 109: 8 are cited in Acts 1: 20 with reference to Judas' end (*op. cit.*, 2, p. 571).

Bultmann refers to Is 57: 4; 2 Kgs 12: 5; Jub 10: 3; Mt 23: 15.¹⁾ The view of Schlatter also combines views. For "the son of perdition" he lists Is 57: 4; 34: 5; 2 Sam 12: 5; Mt 23: 15 and says that the phrase was not coined by Jn, referring to 2 Thess 2: 3; Apoc of Peter; Rev 17: 8, 11. "The γράφη referred to stands in 13: 18." ²⁾

Of these views I prefer the one which regards "the scripture" as a reference to Ps 41: 10 quoted in Jn 13: 18. There may be a similar cross reference in Jn 2: 22 to 2: 17. The words *ἴνα*, etc. may be a gloss, but they fit in well with Jn's whole method of using cross references. Least likely is the view that a new passage from the O. T. is meant here. But the expression "the son of perdition" may be derived from the terminology of the O. T. I should like, therefore, to add the following grist to the mill of commentary.

So far as I know, the only place where υἱός and ἀπώλεια occur together in the LXX is in Prov 24: 22a (cf. texts above). This is, indeed, a curious passage and is not in the MT. If Jn is dependent upon an O. T. source, this passage from Prov is the most likely one. It would probably have been quoted from memory. While the two words in Prov are not in the idiom Jn uses, they do occur together. Moreover, the word φυλάσσω occurs in both passages, and Jn's οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν may be from ἀμφοτέρων or μηθετέρῳ αὐτῶν of the preceding lines. It is interesting to note here that Jn much prefers τηρέω (17 times) to φυλάσσω (only in 12: 25, 47 and 17: 12). But φυλάσσω could be only a stylistic variation for τηρέω in 17: 12 since the latter occurs earlier in the vs.

One thing is certain: Jn takes a familiar Semitic expression, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, and uses it in a creative way in characteristic fashion. Nowhere else in the N. T. is the expression applied to Judas. The word ἀπώλεια is sometimes used in an eschatological context.³⁾ In 2 Thess 2: 3, the only other place in the N. T. where the expression "son of perdition" occurs, it is synonymous with the man of sin or lawlessness who stands in opposition to God. The context in 2 Thess is a discussion of "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Perhaps Jn did see in Judas that eschatological figure who had to appear before the manifestation of the glory of Christ (as in 1 Jn 2: 18, 22; 4: 3, where heretical teachers are referred to as Antichrist).⁴⁾

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 385, n. 5; 386, n. 2.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 322.

³⁾ Cf., e.g., Mt 7: 13; Rom 9: 22; 2 Thess 2: 3; 2 Pet 2: 3; 3: 7; Rev 17: 8, 11. So many times in the LXX.

⁴⁾ Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

I also raise the question about how much the actual expression is influenced by a play on the words ἀπώλετο and ἀπωλείας. Once again Jn has used some passage in a creative way, if, indeed, he has not created the passage. At any rate, what he has written is in harmony with his theme of Judas the betrayer. Here Judas as the "son of perdition" stands in sharp contrast to Jesus as the son of God. Has Judas become a son of destruction because he had not kept the commandment (Prov 24: 22a)? But in spite of all this, I still think the fulfillment refers to Jesus' own words spoken in Jn 6: 70 f. If the reference is to Prov 24: 22a, then this is another place where Jn's quotation shows influence from the wisdom literature of the O. T.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE PARTING OF JESUS' GARMENTS

Jn 19: 24

Texts

Jn 19: 24

Mk 15: 24

ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ·
διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.
διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη.

Mt 27: 35

Lk 23: 34

διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλῆρον
διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους.

Ps 22: 19 (LXX B)

Ps 22: 19 (MT)

διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς,
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.

יחלקו בגדי להם
ועל-לבושי יפילו גורל

Ps 22: 19 (Targ.)

מפלנין לבושי להם
ועלי פתגי ירמון עדבין

Jn's account of Jesus on the cross contains four quotations, the first of which (19: 24) is given in the words of the gospel writer.¹⁾ It is introduced with the formula ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ, and precisely the same formula occurs in Jn only here, in 17: 12, and 19: 36 but nowhere else in the N. T. After the formula some texts add ἡ λεγούσα (R⁰pl).

Ps 22: 19, obvious source of the quotation, is quoted in the same way nowhere else in the N. T.; but it is alluded to, without formulas of introduction, in Mk 15: 24 and parallels. However, in some texts of Mt 27: 35 the passage is quoted exactly as in Jn 19: 24 and introduced with Mt's characteristic formula, "that it might be fulfilled what was spoken

¹⁾ I assume that ἵνα begins the comment of the writer and that his report of the conversation of the soldiers stops with ἔσται. However, the Gr. runs on almost as if the ἵνα, etc. were a part of the soldiers' conversation. The οἱ μὲν of vs. 25 is probably resumptive and would make the distinction clear. Contrast 13: 18; 15: 25; 19: 36 with 12: 38; 19: 24; and 19: 28.

by the prophet" (ΔΘλφ alitvge¹). The LXX of Ps 22: 19 is a literal translation of the MT except that it renders the verbs with the aorist instead of present or future. Jn is an exact quotation from the LXX.¹)

The Synoptic accounts of the crucifixion and death on the cross are marked with allusions to Pss 22, 31, 38 and 69, mostly to Ps 22. Ps 69: 22 is alluded to in Mt 27: 34 (not in Mk 15: 23) = Lk 23: 36; Ps 22: 8 in Mk 15: 29 = Mt 27: 39 = Lk 23: 35; and in Mk 15: 24 = Mt 27: 35 = Lk 23: 34 we have the allusion to Ps 22: 19. In Mt 27: 43 Ps 22: 9 is alluded to; in Mk 15: 34 = Mt 27: 46, Ps 22: 2; and in Mk 15: 36 = Mt 27: 48, Ps 69: 22. Lk 23: 46 alludes to Ps 31: 6 and Lk 23: 49 to Ps 38: 12. None of those passages is introduced as a direct quotation nor is there any mention of the idea of fulfillment.²)

In Jn two of these Synoptic allusions to the Pss are recorded as direct quotations with the idea of fulfillment, the parting of garments in 19: 24 and the reference to Jesus' thirst in 19: 28. While Jn does not have the allusion to "gall" of Ps 69: 22 with Mt 27: 34, he does have the allusion to "vinegar" with Mk 15: 36 = Mt 27: 48 (Lk 23: 36) in 19: 29 f.

It is not my purpose to determine here whether the Synoptic account of the crucifixion and death of Jesus is historical or whether it is a composition on the basis of O. T. allusions or a combination of both. The relationship of Jn's account to that of the Synoptics seems clear. The outline of main events in Jn is parallel to that of the Synoptics, especially to Mk and Mt. Jn's account shows omissions and additions which may be explained as due to his own theological, personal, and literary interests and motives, or, perhaps, by his use of an additional source. We shall limit our discussion to the O. T. allusions in the Synoptics which are relevant to the O. T. quotations in Jn's account, namely, the passage dealing with Jesus' thirst and the one about the parting of his garments. Following the order of Mk and Mt, I shall deal with the former passage first.

In Mk 15: 23 Jesus was simply offered "wine mingled with myrrh, but

¹) Contrast Torrey, who says that the citation is "certainly in Hebrew" (*The Four Gospels*, p. 277).

²) Torrey says that after the crucifixion Ps 22 was regarded by the disciples as fore-shadowing that event and that Ps 69, attributed to David, had its recognized messianic allusion not only in vs. 22 but also in vs. 10 (Jn 2: 17). Torrey then argues that from the absence of allusion to Ps 22: 17 in its LXX form, "they pierced my hands and feet," not in MT or Targum, more striking than any other item in the prediction of the messiah's passion, it was not in the original narrative. Hence the conclusion that the original accounts were in Aram. or Heb. (*Documents*, p. 89). I might add that the passage from LXX Ps 22: 17 becomes popular in Justin's *Apol.* 1 and *Dial.* and later Christian writers.

he did not take it." Perhaps this was in accord with the Jewish custom of offering such a mixture to persons condemned to death in order to alleviate the suffering or to have them become unconscious.¹⁾ In Mt 27: 34 the record is changed and expanded: "They offered him wine to drink, mingled with gall; but when he tasted it, he would not drink it." Here the change from myrrh to gall is probably made under the influence of Ps 69: 22.²⁾ Mk 15: 23 and Mt 27: 34 have no parallel in Lk. In Mk 15: 36 = Mt 27: 48 there is the reference to the filling of a sponge with vinegar, putting it on a reed, and giving it to Jesus to drink.³⁾ In Lk 23: 36 the vinegar is offered to Jesus by the soldiers in mockery.

In Jn 19: 28 f. the main point becomes Jesus' thirst, and that thirst is interpreted as the fulfillment of O. T. scripture. This is good reason to believe the words are put into Jesus' mouth by the author of the gospel.

Coming to the passage about Jesus' garments (Mk 15: 24 = Mt 27: 35 = Lk 23: 34), we find no important difference among the Synoptics. All have the dividing of the clothes by casting lots; the shortest record is in Lk, the longest in Mk. And in the three Synoptics there is just the simple statement with no details.

Apparently the division of Jesus' clothes was in accord with regular procedure. "It is a fact that the clothes of crucified persons, who suffered quite naked, were the perquisites of the executioners." ⁴⁾ Str.-B. say that the division of the clothes indicates Jesus was crucified naked and that this also corresponds to Jewish custom⁵⁾. Under such circumstances the casting of lots for shares of Jesus' clothing would be quite probable, it seems to me, so that there may not be a conscious allusion even to Ps 22. However, if the motive of showing fulfillment of O. T. scripture is the basis for the composition of the narratives of Jesus' crucifixion and death

¹⁾ Cf. here Str.-B., I, pp. 1037 f.; Montefiore, *op. cit.*, I, p. 381; A. E. J. Rawlinson, *St Mark* (1942), p. 233.

²⁾ Unless there was confusion between the Aramaic words מָרְרָה, "gall," and מִיֶּרֶךְ, "myrrh" (Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 68 f.; cf. Torrey, *Documents*, p. 89). Ps 69 was undoubtedly regarded by Christians as messianic. It is quoted or alluded to in Mk 15: 36 = Mt 27: 48; Mt 27: 34; Jn 2: 17; 15: 25; 19: 29; Acts 1: 20; Rom 11: 9 f.; 15: 3; Rev 3: 5; 13: 8; 17: 8; 20: 12, 15; 21: 27. I can find no evidence that the Ps was regarded as messianic by the Jews. R. Jochanan (3rd cent.) applied the invitation of Ruth 2: 14 to the messianic king, and said that "dip your morsel in the vinegar" referred to his suffering (Str.-B., I, p. 1037). But this hardly provided any basis for the Christian allusions here.

³⁾ Whether this is an act of pity or a taunt is not for us to decide. Cf., e.g., Gould, *op. cit.*, p. 295; Montefiore, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 386 f.

⁴⁾ Montefiore, *op. cit.*, I, p. 381.

⁵⁾ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 1038.

on the cross, there might be a conscious allusion to Ps 22 in the Synoptic account.¹⁾

When one compares the Johannine account of Jesus' crucifixion and death on the cross with that of the Synoptics, three things are clear: (1) Jn's outline of main incidents is that of the Synoptics;²⁾ (2) there are Johannine additions, perhaps his own creative embellishments or, possibly, from another source;³⁾ and (3) there is especially an increased influence from or motivation by the O. T.⁴⁾

In Jn 19: 23-25 the story of the division of the garments is given in more detail and in a different way. "When the soldiers had crucified Jesus, they took his clothes (ἱμάτια) and made four parts, a part for each soldier, and the tunic (χιτῶνα). But the tunic was without seam, woven from the top throughout. So they said to one another, 'Let us not tear it but cast lots for it to see whose it shall be.' This was that the scripture might be fulfilled." Then follows the exact quotation from Ps 22: 19.

In view of Jn's creative use of his Synoptic sources and the O. T. in his composition of the narrative of Jesus' crucifixion and death on the cross, his incentive for the use of O. T. quotations in 19: 24 and 19: 28 in the first place came from his understanding of Mk 15: 24 and 15: 23, 36 and parallels. Jn was the first to see in those Synoptic passages, as many have since his time, allusions to O. T. scripture. He makes his interpretation of the drink offered to Jesus and the parting of his garments clear by explaining both as the fulfillment of O. T. scripture. Any question why 19: 24 is a verbal quotation from the LXX⁵⁾ and 19: 28 only a vague allusion must remain unanswered.⁶⁾

¹⁾ Ps 22 was clearly regarded as messianic by the Christians because it is one of the most frequently alluded to or quoted among N. T. writers, along with Pss 2, 69, and 118. In older Jewish literature there is no evidence that Ps 22 was applied to the messiah, but in Rabbinic literature it was (among other interpretations). For the origin and development of its messianic interpretations cf. Str.-B., 2, pp. 574-580.

²⁾ These are the main parallels: Jn 19: 17 with Mk 15: 22; 19: 18 with Mk 15: 27; 19: 19 with Mt 27: 37; 19: 25-27 with Mk 15: 40 f.; 19: 29 with Mk 15: 36; 19: 30 with Mt 27: 50; 19: 31, 38-42 with Mk 15: 42-46. I have listed the most likely Synoptic source; in each case the parallels are to be understood.

³⁾ Cf. 19: 23 f., 31b-34(?), 35-37. The main omissions in Jn are the mockery of the people and derision of the criminals, prodigies of darkness, temple curtain, the resurrection of saints, and the Synoptic words from the cross, for which Jn substitutes his own.

⁴⁾ Specific quotations at four places: 19: 24, 28, 36, 37, as against none in the Synoptics; cf. also 19: 17 with Gen 22: 6; 19: 21 f. with Ps 96: 10; 19: 23 f. with Ex 28: 32; 19: 29 with Ex 12: 22; 19: 30 with LXX of Job 19: 26.

⁵⁾ Another step in the use of this quotation came when it was inserted into later mss. of Mt from Jn 19: 24. Cf. Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 131 and n. 6.

⁶⁾ But see discussion of this passage below. Perhaps Ps 22 was already inter-

Finally, Jn's effort to interpret and supplement the Synoptic account led to the discovery and use of the Ps text. And a curious misunderstanding of the LXX text,¹⁾ which is a reproduction of the Hebrew synonymous parallelism, is analogous to Mt's misunderstanding of his text of Zech 9: 9.²⁾ This misunderstanding led to his embellishment with respect to the story of the ἱμάτια and χιτῶν.³⁾ But, on the other hand, one must always admit the possibility, however slight, that Jn is recording a historical detail which he then understands as the fulfillment of an O. T. prophecy.

preted as messianic in Johannine circles and would, therefore, be more familiar for quotation.

¹⁾ Unless his translation is made from the Heb. text.

²⁾ Cf. Mt 21: 2-7. The words for "garments" in the Targum of Ps 22: 19, לְבוּשׁ, "garment," and פְּתִילָה, "cloak" (Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, 1926), do seem to be more distinct than the words of the Heb. text which are synonyms and so translated by the LXX. Jn may show affinity to the Targum. Cf. the translation by Str.-B., 2, p. 574.

³⁾ Whether or not these terms are symbolic is not for us to decide; cf. Barrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 457 f.; Bultmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 519 f. and notes; Hoskyns, *op. cit.*, p. 529 f.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

JESUS' THIRST

Jn 19:28

Texts

Jn 19:28

ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει· διψῶ.

Ps 69:22 (LXX B)

καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρῶμά μου χολήν,
καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος.

Ps 69:22 (MT)

ויתנו בברותי ראש
ולצמאי ישקוני חמץ

Ps 63:2 (LXX B)

ἐδίψησέν σοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου

Ps 63:2 (MT)

צמאה לך נפשי

I QH 4:11

ויעצורו משקה דעת מצמאים
ולצמאם ישקום חומץ

The second quotation in Jn's narrative of Jesus' death on the cross is put on the lips of Jesus as a saying from the cross. We have already partly discussed this passage in the preceding chapter, but there are several points still to be considered. The quotation is found nowhere else in the N. T. It is introduced with the words, "Jesus . . . in order that the scripture might be accomplished, says." The use of the word *τελειωθῇ*, apparently to indicate fulfillment, instead of *πληρωθῇ* makes this formula a unique one. *τελειόω* is not used anywhere else in the N. T. to indicate the fulfillment of scripture.¹⁾ However, the word *τελέω* is used in a formula to indicate fulfillment in Lk 18:31; 22:37; Acts 13:29; cf. Rev 17:17.

The exact source of the words of the quotation, "I thirst," and the text which the writer may have had in mind must thus far remain unknown. The sources listed in the margin of Nestle's text are Pss 22:16 and

¹⁾ The words "to fulfill the scripture" are put in parentheses in the RSV, perhaps to signify that the translators took the words *ἵνα . . . γραφή* as a gloss; so Moffatt, and Torrey, *The Four Gospels*.

69: 22. W. and H. list only Ps 69: 22. Bultmann ¹⁾ says that the intended scriptural passage is clearly Ps 69: 22 and that Ps 22: 16 hardly comes into question.²⁾ Hoskyns says that the words "I thirst" and the soldiers' action echo a series of passages in the Pss and lists 42: 2; 63: 1; and 69: 21.³⁾ Burney is content to say, "The reference is general merely."⁴⁾

Qumran Hymns 4: 11 alludes to Ps 69: 22 in a context where the writer is probably describing his enemies: "They have withheld the drink of knowledge from the thirsty and in their thirst given them vinegar to drink."

The formula *ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή* may indicate that Jn had an O. T. passage in mind. The weight of suggestion seems to be in favor of Ps 69: 22 because of the mention of "vinegar" in Jn 19: 29 and the supposed allusion to or quotation of the passage in Mk 15: 23 and parallels. On the other hand, Jn's use of *τελειόω*, used only here in a formula of fulfillment⁵⁾ (so far as I know, at least), is a clue for us to suspect here a purely literary-theological motive for the creation of a supposed quotation from scripture which may or may not be influenced by the recollection of some O. T. passage such as Ps 69: 22; 42: 2 f.; 22: 16; or 63: 1.⁶⁾ Moreover, Jn 19: 28 f. is one of the clearest examples of the writer's creative use of his Synoptic sources showing his own literary-theological changes and additions. Jn was the first interpreter of the Synoptics to see in Mk 15: 23 (or Mt 27: 34) and parallels an allusion to O. T. scripture. He makes this point clear by introducing what he believed to be a specific quotation, making a further change by putting it on the lips of Jesus. It may not be going too far to suggest that the supposed quotation is entirely an invention to satisfy Jn's literary and theological interests.

Jn's motive for the use of *τελειόω* cannot be completely determined. It may be synonymous for *πληρόω* or *τελέω*. It may be only a stylistic or literary variation with *τελέω* used immediately before and again in vs. 30. Or it may well have some theological significance in the mind

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 522, n. 3.

²⁾ Others who mention only Ps 69: 22 are Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 301, n. 3; Torrey, *Documents*, p. 89; Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 459; Bernard, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 638; R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel* (1943), p. 320.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 531.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

⁵⁾ It is conceivable that *τελειόω* is meant to be parallel to *πληρόω*. Bultmann shows where the two words are used in synonymous parallelism, but not of the fulfillment of scripture (*op. cit.*, p. 522, n. 3). It may also be a synonym for *τελέω* which is used in a formula of fulfillment.

⁶⁾ Schlatter gives one Rabbinic parallel to this quotation (*op. cit.*, p. 351).

of Jn.¹⁾ With the writer's words, "Jesus, knowing that all was now finished" (vs. 28), and Jesus' words, "It is finished" (vs. 30),²⁾ cf. Jn 4: 34; 5: 36; 17: 4 where Jesus uses the word *τελειόω* of the "work" of God which he must do.³⁾ Perhaps the "scripture" about Jesus must be "finished" or "accomplished" in the same way the "works" of Jesus himself seem to be thought of as being accomplished with his death on the cross.⁴⁾

In the Synoptics—if there is an intended allusion to the O. T.—the point of fulfillment lies only in the offering of the drink to Jesus. But in Jn the point of fulfillment lies in Jesus' actual thirst.⁵⁾ And in Jn Jesus actually took the vinegar whereas in Mk 15: 36 and parallels it is not specifically stated that Jesus took the vinegar, although it may be implied. Again Jn makes the uncertainty of the Synoptic account absolutely clear and expands it to convey the theological and/or symbolic meaning he sees in the event he records. "When he had taken the vinegar, Jesus said, 'It is finished.'" Whatever meaning Jn wished to convey is not known to us.

Whether or not Jn intended an allusion to Ps 69: 22 in 19: 29, it is difficult to say.⁶⁾ It is clear that he saw such an allusion in Mk 15: 23 and parallels and made the point clear by introducing a formal quotation in vs. 28. But in spite of his use of the word *ἔξος* after the word *διψῶ*, I am not sure he intended an allusion to Ps 69: 22 in vs. 29.⁷⁾ Rather,

¹⁾ Perhaps the use of *τελειόω* is intended to indicate "the complete fulfilment of Scripture" (Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 459). Hoskyns: "The death of Jesus is the completion of the Scriptures" (*op. cit.*, p. 531). Bultmann, on the other hand, says, "It appears that as in 13: 18 the fulfilment of a definite scripture passage is meant" (*op. cit.*, p. 522, n. 3).

²⁾ Jesus is in control of all events in Jn's passion narrative as he has been in control of everything throughout the gospel.

³⁾ The only other use of *τελειόω* in Jn occurs in 17: 23; cf. Acts 20: 24. In Heb 5: 9 and 7: 28 Jesus himself is "perfected."

⁴⁾ Jacob Enz calls attention to the parallel with Moses in Ex 40: 33 b ("The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John," *JBL* 76 (1957), p. 211). Cf. H. Sahlin, who says Jesus' word in Jn 19: 30 means: "Jetzt ist das Ziel des neuen Exodus erreicht, jetzt ist das grosse Pesach-Opfer vollbracht und das Heil verwirklicht" (*Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums* (1950), p. 58).

⁵⁾ Perhaps in accordance with the writer's emphasis on the humanity of Jesus; so Bernard, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 635. Contrast the view of Bultmann who says that it is hardly to be thought that Jesus, who himself offers the living water which quenches all thirst (4: 10 ff.), here attains the high point of fleshly existence (*op. cit.*, p. 522, n. 4).

⁶⁾ Commentators in general see such an allusion, but I suspect only because they had already seen it in the Synoptic account.

⁷⁾ Against Bernard, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 638 and Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 351.

Jn uses the Synoptic narrative of Mk 15: 36 and parallels and changes it, in characteristic fashion, to suit his own theological purpose. Jn adds to the account that "a vessel full of vinegar stood there" (cf. 2: 6), a fact certainly implied in the Synoptic narrative. He retains "a sponge full of vinegar"¹⁾ but changes the Synoptic "reed" to "hyssop." And for the Synoptic "and gave it to him to drink" Jn has "and held it to his mouth." The change to hyssop probably has some theological or symbolic significance, the meaning of which, though known to Jn, thus far remains unknown to us.²⁾

¹⁾ This may be a historical detail; cf. Montefiore on Mk 15: 36 (*op. cit.*, 1, p. 387) and Bernard (*op. cit.*, 2, p. 638).

²⁾ Hoskyns calls attention to the fact that twigs of hyssop were used in Hebrew ritual cleansings (Lev 14: 4, 6; Num 19: 18; Ps 51: 7) and for sprinkling doors of homes during the Passover season (Ex 12: 22) and says that the reader is reminded "that the Jewish Passover is fulfilled in the sacrifice of the true Paschal Lamb . . ." (*op. cit.*, p. 531); cf. Str.-B., 2, p. 581. Hyssop would be ill fitted for use in giving a wet sponge to a man on a cross. Cf. Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 460. Bultmann denies that hyssop is intended to point out Jesus as the paschal lamb (*op. cit.*, p. 522, n. 4).

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

BREAKING THE CRIMINALS' LEGS AND PIERCING JESUS' SIDE

Jn 19:36, 37

Texts

Jn 19:36, 37

ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ· ὅστουν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ. καὶ πάλιν
ἑτέρα γραφή λέγει· ὀψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.

Rev 1:7

ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ
οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ
κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ
τῆς γῆς.

Ex 12:10 (LXX B)

καὶ ὅστουν οὐ συντρίψεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Ex 12:46 (LXX B)

καὶ ὅστουν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Num 9:12 (LXX B)

καὶ ὅστουν οὐ συντρίψουσιν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Ps 34:21 (LXX B)

φυλάσσει πάντα τὰ ὀστέα αὐτῶν,
ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ συντριβήσεται.

Zech 12:10 (LXX B)

καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ
ἄνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο

Mt 24:30

κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς
γῆς καὶ ὀψονται τὸν υἱὸν
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Ex 12:46 (MT)

ועצם לא תשברו בו

Num 9:12 (MT)

ועצם לא ישברו בו

Ps 34:21 (MT)

שמר כל-עצמותיו
אחת מהנה לא נשברה

Zech 12:10 (MT)

והביטו אלי
את אשר-דקרו

The last two quotations in Jn's gospel conclude his account of Jesus' death on the cross. We shall treat them together since they are separated only by the formula of introduction for the second. In this respect this set of quotations is unique, but the two in 12:38-40 are separated also

only by the formula for the second plus a brief comment by the author. Cf. also the compound quotation in 7: 42. Both quotations are in the words of the author and are found nowhere else in the N. T. The words from Zech 12: 10 are alluded to in Rev 1: 7. Cf. also Mt 24: 30. For the formula introducing the first quotation see my comments under Jn 13: 18; 15: 25; and 19: 24. Here a preceding ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα is inserted before ἵνα, etc. The formula for the second, καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει, occurs nowhere else in the N. T. The closest ones to it are διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει (Acts 13: 35) and καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει (Heb 5: 6). Cf. also Rom 15: 9-12; 1 Cor 3: 20; Mt 4: 7; Heb 1: 5-13; 4: 5; 10: 30. Schlatter gives two formulas from Rabbinic literature very similar to this one.¹⁾

The sources usually given for the first quotation are Ex 12: 46 (12: 10 also, in LXX); Num 9: 12; and Ps 34: 21; cf. also Ps 22: 17 f. The source of the second quotation is Zech 12: 10. In both cases one cannot decide immediately whether the author is quoting from the Heb. or Gr. text.

With respect to the first quotation Burney says only that it is "a free reminiscence."²⁾ With respect to Zech 12: 10 he says that some fifty Heb. mss. read אָלָיו, "on him," and it is this text upon which Jn is dependent. Since אֶת אֲשֶׁר (אָלָיו) is hardly possible as a Heb. construction, Jn may presuppose the more natural reading אֶל-אֲשֶׁר. The reading of the LXX is based on a reading דָּקְרוּ, "they danced," an erroneous transposition of the letters דָּקְרוּ, "they pierced." Burney mentions that several LXX mss., representing the recension of Lucian,³⁾ read καὶ ἐπιβλέπονται πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, which is the reading of Th. "It is obvious that Jn. is independent of LXX, whose rendering destroys the point of the quotation." He says the connection with Th. is "fortuitous merely," and does not imply that Jn and Th. "were dependent upon an earlier non-Septuagintal rendering (as suggested by Swete, *Introd. to the O. T. in Greek*, p. 398)." Burney notes that ἐκκεντέω is the natural rendering of דָּקַר in the LXX, used in Jud 9: 54; 1 Chr 10: 4; Jer 44 (37): 10; Lam 4: 9 and Aq. and Sym. of Is 13: 15.⁴⁾ He rightly says,

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 355. For a comparison of the formulas in Jn and other N. T. writings with those in the Mishnah cf. Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," *JBL* 70 (1951), pp. 297-307.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

³⁾ Listed in the apparatus of *Septuaginta . . . Gottingensis*, vol. xiii, *Duodecim prophetæ*, ed. J. Ziegler (1943).

⁴⁾ Also Th. of Is 13: 15; and I might add that κατορχέομαι occurs in the LXX only in Zech 12: 10. On the other hand, ἐπιβλέπω is used in LXX for נִבֵּט about 34 times while ὁράω is used for נִבֵּט only in Num 12: 8; Job 6: 19; Is 38: 11.

"The variation between Jn.'s ὁψονται εἰς ὃν and Theodotion's ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὃν is decisive against common borrowing from an earlier Greek source." Finally, he says that Rev 1:7 echoes the passage from Zech 12:10 and notes that both verbs are the same as those in Jn.¹⁾

Torrey says of 19:36 that Jn may have been thinking of Ex 12:46 and Num 9:12 but more probably Ps 34:21. He recognizes that the words of Jn do not fit any of the passages in either Heb. or Gr. The form of the verb, point of chief importance, is in agreement with the Ps—but not with the other passages—in both Heb. and Gr.: "συντριβήσεται (וְשִׁבְּרָה); as against συντρίψετε (וְתִשְׁבְּרוּ) and συντρίψουσιν (וְיִשְׁבְּרוּ). The most natural way of abridging the verse in the Psalter is in precisely the words of our text. On the other hand, it is very significant that in *both* verses of the Pentateuch the reading is ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. As a mere matter of textual evidence, there can be no question that Ps. 34:21 is indicated as the source of the quotation."²⁾ Of Jn 19:37 Torrey says that the original text in this verse of Zech can only have been: וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלָיו אֶשֶׁר דָּקְרוּ (the text actually rendered in Jn and presupposed in Rev 1:7. The ו in אֵלָיו was accidentally dropped in the MT. This necessitated the insertion of אֵת ("with").³⁾

Among commentators the preference for both O. T. passage and text in vs. 36 seems to be predetermined on the basis of whether or not the individual commentator believes that Jn portrays Jesus as the paschal lamb. Bultmann says that it is doubtful which scripture is meant for vs. 36. In the mind of the evangelist Ex 12:46 would be thought of in connection with the paschal lamb. In the source Ps 34:21 could be meant where it says of the righteous: ἁγίος . . . συντριβήσεται—not only because of the pass. verb and because the Pss especially have played a part in the shaping of the passion-history, but especially because in vss. 31-37 there is no reference to the Passover which was so near. Bultmann, like Burney, explains the LXX's reading in Zech 12:10 as a misreading of רִקְרוּ for דָּקְרוּ. After mentioning the readings of Aq., Th., Sym., Rev 1:7, Justin, *Apol.* 1, 52:12, *Ep. of Barn.* 7:9, and others, Bultmann says: "Perhaps an edited LXX text lay before the author."⁴⁾

Bernard says that Jn 19:36 is "a free quotation" of Ex 12:46 and refers also to Num 9:12. Ps 34:21, in spite of verbal similarities, "is

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

²⁾ "The Date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 50 (1931), p. 231.

³⁾ *Documents*, p. 182, n.

⁴⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 524, n. 8 and 9.

not apposite to the context." To Jn the reference to the Passover lamb "was a prophetic ordinance, and pointed forward to the manner of the death of Him who was the true Paschal Lamb." In this identification Paul (1 Cor 5: 7) is in agreement with Jn. In discussing our quotation from Zech, Bernard says: "The manner of the Lord's death was, according to Jn., in fulfilment both of *type* and *prophecy*; negatively, because His legs were not broken as the usual custom was in the case of crucified persons, so that the type of the Paschal Lamb might be fulfilled in Him; and positively, by the piercing of His side, as had been prophesied in Zech. 12: 10 . . ." He also accepts the idea of misreading on the part of the LXX. After referring to the reading of Aq., Th., Sym., Rev 1: 7, and Justin, *Apol.* 1, 52 and *Dial.* 64 and 32, Bernard concludes: "It is clear that Jn. did not use the LXX here, and while he may have translated independently from the Hebrew, it is more probable that he has adopted a version current in his time." ¹⁾

Barrett lists 19: 36 among these quotations which might be based on either the Heb. or Gr. text. He recognizes the difficulty in finding the source and points to Ex 12: 46; Num 9: 12; Ps 34: 21, giving the context of each. "It is probable that the reference is primarily to the Passover (since Jesus died at the time of the sacrifice; hyssop has already been mentioned at v. 29; and Jesus had not been preserved from death, even though his bones had not been broken); yet we cannot exclude the influence of the Psalm since here only is the verbal form συντριβήσεται used." Barrett lists 19: 37 as the one instance where Jn sides with the Heb. against the Gr. "John accurately follows Zech. 12: 10 in the Hebrew . . ." ²⁾ Barrett also explains the diversion of the LXX as a misreading. "Clearly John is not dependent upon the LXX, but whether he himself translated the Hebrew or used some existing version (perhaps a testimony book) it is impossible to say. Cf. a different handling of this *testimonium* in Rev. 1: 7; also Mark 13: 26; *Didache* 16: 7; and Justin, I *Apol.*, 52 . . ." ³⁾

Hoskyns also accepts the idea of Jesus as the paschal lamb and points to Num 9: 12 and Ex 12: 46 and refers to Ps 34: 20 f. for Jn 19: 36. In Zech 12: 10 the LXX translator has misread his text, and "the messianic

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2, pp. 651 f.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 23, 464.

³⁾ *Ibid.* I fail to see a reference to Zech 12: 10 in Mk 13: 26 and *Didache* 16: 7. The reference in Mk is to only Dan 7: 13, a passage which is sometimes combined with Zech 12: 10 f. as, e.g., in Mt 24: 30; Rev 1: 7. In *Didache* 16: 7 the allusion is to Zech 14: 5.

application of the prophecy both here and in Rev. 1:7 preserves the meaning of the Hebrew original." ¹⁾

In contrast to the commentators mentioned above, Dodd does not argue for an allusion to the paschal lamb and Passover. The form of Jn 19:36 is near enough to Ex 12:46 and Num 9:12 to be a free citation of one of those passages, but it might equally be a free citation of Ps 34:21. But Dodd's theory of testimonies influences his choice of the Ps text. He says that of the scriptures said to have been fulfilled in the events of the crucifixion two are from Pss (22:19 and 69:22), the other from Zech 12:10 where the original reference "is somewhat obscure." By taking Jn 19:36 as a reference to Ps 34:21, "we have a consistent series of three citations from Psalms which speak of the afflictions of the righteous and their deliverance. A reference, on the other hand, to the paschal ritual would stand isolated." In a footnote the motive for Dodd's choice becomes clear: "The Psalms of the Righteous Sufferer, closely allied to the poems of the Suffering Servant in II Isaiah, are among the principal sources of *testimonia* for all New Testament writers." ²⁾

Schlatter lists for Jn 19:36 Ex 12:46 and Num 9:12 and points to Ps 34:21 for the pass. verb. But he says it is not apparent whether Jn has compared the crucified Jesus to the slaughtered Passover lamb. He gives one parallel to Zech 12:10 and Jn 19:37 from Rabbinic literature.³⁾

Can we come to any conclusions concerning the quotations about the breaking of the criminals' legs and the piercing of Jesus' side? Jn 19:36 is clearly a free citation, perhaps from memory, of Ex 12:10 (LXX), 46 or Num 9:12 or Ps 34:21 or a combination of the Ps with one of the others. The arguments of Torrey for a preference for Ps 34:21 to the others are not entirely convincing. It is obviously true that the verb in Jn agrees exactly with the Gr. of the Ps, but it is hardly in agreement with the Heb. of the Ps. The Heb. form is either 3rd sing. f. Ni. perf. or s. f. Ni. part. Of the eight places in the O. T. where the former form is listed in Mendelkern ⁴⁾ (two, Jer 48:4, 25, do not occur in the LXX) Ps 34:21 is the only place where the LXX translates it with a fut. pass. In the other places (1 Sam 22:49; Is 24:10; Jer 14:17; Ezek 26:2; Dan 8:8) an aor. pass. form is used. Of the seven places where the latter form is listed (Ps 51:19; Ezek 27:34; 30:22; 34:4, 16; Zech 11:16; Dan 8:22) one is translated with an aor. pass., the others with a perf. pass.

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 535 f.

²⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 234 and n. 1; cf. also pp. 424, 428, n. 1.

³⁾ *Op. cit.*, pp. 354 f.

⁴⁾ *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*, 2nd ed. (1925).

part. In view of this evidence, if Jn was using Ps 34: 21, he was most likely using the LXX textual tradition rather than exactly translating the Heb. form, unless he definitely regarded the Heb. form as a part. and translated it very freely.

In the other two passages (Ex 12: 46; Num 9: 12) the verb is already future active, although in pl. pers., in both Heb. and Gr. Jn's change to third sing. fut. pass. may well be intentional to make the passage appear as a prediction and refer specifically to Jesus. Moreover, Jn's sing. ὁστοῦν and αὐτοῦ correspond exactly to both the Heb. and Gr. of Ex 12: 10 (LXX), 46 and Num 9: 12 as against the pl. of both forms in both the MT and LXX of Ps 34: 21. Jn's omission of the prep. (א, ἀπ', ἐξ) would be a natural one when using αὐτοῦ of a person.

Dodd's argument for Ps 34: 21 is less convincing than that of Torrey. I am not convinced that Ps 34 is a "*testimonium* for the Passion of Christ" in spite of allusions to it in 1 Pet 2: 3; 3: 10-12; Lk 1: 53; Heb 12: 14 (a passage which Dodd omits).¹⁾ Those passages have little if anything to do with the passion of Christ. Dodd's case here for a *testimonium* would be much stronger if he could show that Jn 19: 36 (with 19: 37) is a free citation of Ps 22: 15-18 because Ps 22 was clearly regarded as messianic by the Christians.²⁾ Of course, the text of Jn has almost nothing in common with those vss., but Ps 22: 19 was quoted in 19: 24, and the Ps may have played a part in shaping the context of Jn.³⁾

On a purely textual basis, it is impossible to tell definitely the source of the quotation or the text used in Jn 19: 36. The Gr. of Jn has more in common with both the Heb. and Gr. of Ex and Num than with the Ps. If the change in Jn's verb cannot be accounted for as I have suggested, we may have a conflated quotation from Ex and the Ps composed freely, quite likely from memory. If the Ps passage is excluded, the text of Jn as a whole, with the 3rd per. sing. verb, is closer to the LXX of Ex 12: 10 (which has an addition not in the MT) than to any other, and must be considered as the most likely direct source. Jn's verb would be a slight correction from the third sing. fut. mid. form to the third sing. fut. pass. form which makes better sense and satisfies his theological view completely.

¹⁾ *According to the Scriptures* (1952), pp. 98 f.

²⁾ See remarks under Jn 19: 24 above and Dodd, *ibid.*, p. 97.

³⁾ Cf. Jn 19: 24 and Ps 22: 19; 19: 28 f. and 22: 16; 19: 37 and 22: 16; Justin, *Apol.* 1, 35: 5; 1, 38: 4; *Dial.* 97: 3; 104: 1 where the piercing of hands and feet of Ps 22: 16 and the parting of garments of Ps 22: 19 are combined in contexts dealing with the crucifixion of Jesus.

Whether or not Jn thought of Jesus as the paschal lamb is a problem difficult to decide in itself. If he did, the text from Ex or Num would be the logical source of his quotation in 19: 36. I rather think that the formula, "For these things took place in order that the scripture might be fulfilled," gives ample reason to suspect a theological motive for the use of the quotation in the first place. In view of Jn's presentation of Jesus as the lamb of God (1: 29, 36), his change in time of the crucifixion, his introduction of hyssop into the crucifixion narrative, and in view of other N. T. passages (such as 1 Cor 5: 7; Acts 8: 32; 1 Pet 1: 19; Rev 5: 6, 9; 7: 14), it seems reasonable to suspect Jn's theological view of Jesus as the paschal lamb as the motive responsible for the use of the quotation. On this point Bernard's arguments are enticing, if not convincing.¹⁾

For Jn 19: 37 the source universally given is Zech 12: 10, generally from the Heb. text. Because the verb used in the LXX of Zech 12: 10 occurs nowhere else in the O. T., and since that reading is not quoted anywhere else, we must accept the suggestion of Burney and others that the translator misread רקרי instead of דקרי. Here the view of Torrey with his reconstruction of the Heb. text seems entirely sound, especially since ἐκκεντέω (or some closely related form) is the reading not only of both Jn and Rev but also in places where Zech 12: 10 is cited among early Christian writers.²⁾ The remark of Burney that the variation between Jn's ὁψονται εἰς ὄν and Theodotion's ἐπιβλ. πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὄν "is decisive against common borrowing from an earlier Greek source"³⁾ is accepted.

Perhaps one may tentatively conclude that the reading of Jn and Rev, including the verb ὀράω, was of Christian origin (cf. also Mt 24: 30 and parallels) and that the reading was derived from a translation of some Heb. text and originated with Jn himself (or the writer of Rev, if a different person). Cf. the statement of Swete that the reading of Jn "is a non-Septuagintal rendering" of Zech 12: 10.⁴⁾ The rest of Swete's statement, that the text was perhaps current in Palestine since εἰς,

¹⁾ Cf. discussion of Bernard above and *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 43-47; 2, pp. 651 f.; cf. also Bultmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 525, 514, n. 5; the views of Barrett and Hoskyns presented above; Strachan, *op. cit.*, pp. 113 ff., 323. Contrast the view of Dodd (given above), *The Interpretation*, pp. 236, 424, 233-235, 427 f., and cf. Str.-B., 2, pp. 363-370, 583, 840 f.

²⁾ A point which Torrey does not make. Cf. esp. *Ep. of Barn.* 7: 9; Justin, *Apol.* 1, 52: 12; *Dial.* 14: 8; 32: 2; 64: 7; 118: 1.

³⁾ Th., like Jn, in spite of the differences between them, appears to be closer to the Heb. On this whole point cf. Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 159, 179, 212 ff.

⁴⁾ *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (1914), p. 398.

etc. appears also in Th., is refuted by Burney. Against Swete cf. also E. Nestle: "This supposition is simply a proof of unwillingness to admit a palpable fact—viz., that in the Gospel and Apocalypse John gives an independent rendering of the original text of Zechariah xii. 10, and that Barnabas [7: 9] and Justin [*Dial.* 32] follow John." ¹⁾

I find Nestle's conclusion rather acceptable. I suggest, however, an alternative possibility: Jn's ὀψονται may be a misreading of the LXX's κόψονται—leaving off the first letter—which occurs in Zech 12: 10 and is frequently included as part of the quotation among early Christian writers. The error may thus be due to a mistaken sound in a passage recited by memory. Perhaps the reading εἰς δὲ ἐξεκέντησαν of the Lucianic mss. of the LXX is also to be attributed to Christian influence. Or did the tradition of Lucian somehow influence Jn and Justin? Was the first draft of Jn's gospel composed at Antioch?²⁾ One must, therefore, consider the possibility that Jn has taken over a version current in his time,³⁾ perhaps even a *testimonium* text.⁴⁾ Consequently, if we have here a tradition strictly Johannine (Jn-Rev) or common Ephesian (Jn-Rev-Th.) rather than something *gemeinchristlich*,⁵⁾ the tradition soon became *gemeinchristlich*.

In view of the fact that Zech 12: 10 is alluded to in an apocalyptic context in Mt 24: 30, Rev 1: 7, and in most early Christian writers, we may have a clue to its interpretation in Jn. The subject of ὀψονται is not stated, so the problem of finding one arises. On the basis of the immediate context alone one might understand as subject the soldiers who were responsible for the piercing. Bultmann says that it must be the Jews.⁶⁾ So Bernard: "It was to the Jews that Jesus was delivered to be crucified (v. 16), and the piercing was, indirectly, their act." ⁷⁾ I suggest, however, that Jn, in harmony with Mt, Rev, and the others, also had in mind Jesus' second coming and that the subject of ὀψονται then becomes those persons who had not believed in Jesus, who were responsible for his death, and would recognize Jesus when he came again in spite of his death.⁸⁾ It is true, as Bultmann says,⁹⁾ that the idea of Jesus returning

¹⁾ *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament* (1901), p. 291.

²⁾ Cf. Maurice Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2, *Le Quatrième Evangile* (1924), p. 550.

³⁾ So, e.g., Bernard and Bultmann, as we have seen.

⁴⁾ So, e.g., Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 65 and Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

⁵⁾ Cf. Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 65. Cf. also Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 159 f.

⁶⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 525, n. 1.

⁷⁾ *Op. cit.*, 2, p. 652.

⁸⁾ The idea of Jesus' second coming is present at several places in Jn; cf., e.g., 5: 28 f.; 13: 36; 14: 2 f., 18 f., 23, 28; 20: 25-29; esp. 16: 16-22.

⁹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 525, n. 1.

in the Parousia is not present as in Rev and Justin, but it is hardly true that in Justin (though it is true for Rev) the ἐξέκ. doesn't mean the piercing but the crucifixion generally, especially the piercing of the hands and feet of Jesus. Perhaps we can not be so certain as Bultmann ¹⁾ that Zahn is wrong when he says that the Jews, according to Zech, would be seized by penitent grief and lamentation. This lamentation on the part of the inhabitants of Jerusalem is the main point of Zech 12: 10-14; it is frequently included with the quotation in early Christian writers; and it coincides perfectly with Jn's own point of view in 16: 16-22. It is also a part of Rev 1: 7 and Mt 24: 30. But if this was a part of Jn's mind when he inserted the quotation, we do not know. Perhaps the use of a new formula for the second quotation here—instead of a connecting καί as in 7: 42—with the use of "another scripture" is meant to indicate that the passage quoted should be applied to another subject. Contrast 7: 42; 12: 13-15; 12: 38-40. As the quotation in 19: 37 now stands, with the subject of ὀψονταί in doubt, it is a bit removed from the context. But the suggestions we have offered may be reading far too much into the text, perhaps even into the mind of Jn.

¹⁾ *Ibid.*

CONCLUSIONS

There is presented here a brief summary of our conclusions for each quotation separately and then a formulation of some general conclusions with respect to the quotations as a whole. It has seemed best to reserve for this place our conclusions about Jn's use of early Christian *testimonia*.

Jn 1: 23. The quotation is in the words of the Baptist in reply to the Jews who asked him who he was. It occurs also in Mk 1: 3 = Mt 3: 3 = Lk 3: 4. The formula, which, as in 17: 12, follows the quotation, is: "Thus said Isaiah the prophet"; and it occurs nowhere else in the N. T. The source of the quotation is Is 40: 3, but it is impossible to tell whether Jn used the Heb. or Gr. text. The addition of ἐγώ is to emphasize the point that the Baptist himself realized his own inferiority and, at the same time, the superiority of Jesus. This is characteristic of the method of Jn in his presentation of the story of the Baptist. The change from ἐτοιμάζω to εὐθύνω is for moral and ethical emphasis and shows a kinship to the wisdom literature of the Heb. and Gr. O. T. Jn may purposely interpret or supplement the Synoptic tradition. In view of the difference between Jn and the Synoptics there is no evidence for Jn's use of *testimonia*.

Jn 2: 17. The quotation is put in the words of Jesus' disciples immediately after the narrative of Jesus' cleansing of the temple. It occurs nowhere else in the N. T. The formula is: "His disciples remembered that it was written." The comment about the disciples remembering occurs nowhere else in the N. T. but is a part of the style of Jn; cf. also 2: 22 and 12: 16. The use of γεγραμμένον with ἐστίν occurs nowhere outside of Jn in the N. T. but is a favorite usage with him; cf. 6: 31; 6: 45; 10: 34; 12: 14, 16. The source is Ps 69: 10, and the quotation agrees literally with mss. B^x of the LXX as we now have them. However, the evidence presented, while not conclusive, tends to indicate that the verb in the LXX was originally in the past tense and that the present reading of the LXX B^x is probably due to Christian influence from Jn. The change to the future tense in Jn was made necessary by the context which required a future to make the O. T. passage appear as a prediction. Jesus' action in cleansing the temple shows fulfillment of an O. T. prophecy, an innovation in Jn and may be made to supplement the Synoptic account. The fact that the quotation occurs nowhere else in the N. T. makes it unlikely that Jn's quotation was a *testimonium*. This is

true in spite of the fact that Rom 15: 3 cites the second half of Ps 69: 10.

Jn 6: 31. This quotation is in the words of the multitude, and it seems to set the stage for Jesus' discourse on the bread of life which follows. It occurs nowhere else in the N. T. The exact formula, "Just as it is written," occurs also in Jn 12: 14 but nowhere else in the N. T. The quotation appears to be a combination of Ex 16: 4 and Ps 78: 24 and contains elements from both the Heb. and Gr. texts. It also shows some affinity to the Targum of Ex 16: 15. Jn uses the quotation in presenting Jesus as "the bread of life" who stands in strong contrast to Moses, who was regarded as the first redeemer and was thought to have given the manna which the Jewish fathers ate in the wilderness and died. The fact that the quotation is used nowhere else in the N. T. is against Jn's use of a *testimonium*.

Jn 6: 45. This quotation is on the lips of Jesus who uses it to defend himself against the murmuring of the Jews because he had said he was the bread of life which came down from heaven. It is found nowhere else in the N. T. The formula, "it is written in the prophets," occurs only here. The main source of the quotation is Is 54: 13, but it is impossible to tell whether Jn used the Heb. or Gr. text. The context seems to indicate that Jn also had in mind several other O. T. passages, especially Jer 31: 31-34. The vocabulary of Jn seems to show influence from the Targum of Is 54: 13 and Jer 31: 31 ff. The most important difference in Jn from the Heb. and Gr. texts is the omission of the words "your sons." This omission is to be explained as intentional to support Jn's theological motive of showing that Jesus as "the bread of life," with his message, was not limited to the children of Zion. The emphasis is on "all." The fact that the passage occurs nowhere else in the N. T. is against Jn's use of *testimonia*.

Jn 7: 37 f. Occurring on the lips of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles, this quotation is found nowhere else in the N. T. The formula, "just as the scripture said," is used only here in the N. T. The evidence at present is not sufficient to determine the exact O. T. source of the quotation or the text used. Several ideas influencing Jn are found in passages like Is 12: 3; 43: 19 f.; 44: 3; 55: 1 f.; 58: 11; Zech 14: 8; Jer 2: 13; 17: 13; Prov 18: 4; and several from the Qumran Scrolls. The quotation in Jn is best explained as a combination of several O. T. passages in a creative way to support his Christian point of view. It is a spontaneous quotation, perhaps from memory, to support the balancing themes of Jesus as the bread of life and the giver of living water. Water here is symbolic of the spirit, as sometimes in the O. T. and the Qumran Scrolls.

The thought and language of Jn show influence from the wisdom literature of the O. T. The chief passage here is Prov 18: 4 in its LXX form. There is no evidence for Jn's use of a testimony text.

Jn 7: 42. This quotation is on the lips of the multitude who hear Jesus speak at the Feast of Tabernacles and wonder if he is the Christ and if the Christ can come from Galilee. It is found nowhere else in the N. T. The precise formula, "has not the scripture said (that)," occurs only here in the N. T. Neither the exact O. T. source nor the text used can be determined definitely. Among other O. T. passages these are the most likely direct sources: Mic 5: 1; 2 Sam 5: 2; 7: 12; Ps 89: 4 f., 36 f.; 1 Sam 20: 6; Ps 18: 51; 1 Kgs 2: 33; Jer 33: 22; 1 Kgs 11: 39; Is 11: 1. Again Jn shows affinity to the Targum of several passages, Mic 5: 1; Jer 23: 5; 33: 15; Is 11: 1. The evidence indicates that the use of Mic 5: 1 as a proof text seems to be only a Christian *ad hoc* creation to confirm the Christian tradition of Jesus' birth at Bethlehem. Therefore, Jn is directly dependent upon Mt and Lk for the source of this quotation. "From the seed of David" is to be taken as Jn's equivalent of the Lucan phrase, "from the house and family of David." The second part of the quotation, "from Bethlehem the village where David was," is the Johannine equivalent of Lk's "to the city of David which is called Bethlehem." The last part of the quotation, "the Christ comes," is Jn's equivalent to the Matthaean clause, "where the Christ should be born." Jn may also have been influenced by Lk 2: 11: "who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David." Finally, ἡ γραφή here is to be taken as referring only indirectly to an O. T. passage and more directly to the Synoptic passages themselves. Examples of the use of ἡ γραφή with reference to a N. T. writing have been provided from early Christian Fathers and from the N. T. itself. There is no evidence for Jn's use of *testimonia*.

In view of the evidence presented in Chapter 6 with regard to the use of ἡ γραφή and other formulas to introduce quotations from N. T. writings, we have to conclude that some of the sayings of and about Jesus were very early put into writing and used with the same authority in the early church as O. T. scripture. After all, the Qumran Scrolls and Paul's letters were written. Again, authority in the Qumran community centered around the Teacher of Righteousness (or Righteous Teacher). To him God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets. In early Christian communities authority centered around Jesus of Nazareth. Wouldn't an early Christian writing containing words of Jesus or about Jesus soon come to be regarded as γραφή, a

writing with authority? These writings were soon quoted, in order to promote the Christian cause, on the same basis of authority as the writings of the O. T. The evidence we have presented from the early Fathers and the N. T., while not conclusive, tends to indicate that Jn was the first N. T. writer to refer to an earlier Christian writing as ἡ γραφή. Exactly what the term meant to him, except that it was authoritative, is not certain. It may have meant only a writing or written source which he had read or used, perhaps still without a name, but a written tradition, nevertheless. We have suggested the traditions of Mt and Lk, if not the actual gospel passages themselves. We have even been bold enough to suggest also that the words "according to the scriptures" in 1 Cor 15: 3-8 include writings from the Christian tradition, if, indeed, the reference is not only to them.

It seems as though we must come to admit the existence of Christian writing (γραφή) earlier than formerly thought. While not yet fixed nor regarded as sacred—and certainly differing in details—such writings were regarded as authoritative enough to be quoted by other Christian writers whose own writings became better known. According to Eusebius, Papias (c. 140) already knew of the existence of Christian books. We learn that Papias "did not suppose that the things from books would help him so much as the things he heard from a living and abiding voice" (*H. E.* 3: 39: 4).

Jn 10: 34. This quotation is on the lips of Jesus in reply to the Jews who want to stone him for blasphemy because, being a man, he makes himself God. It is found nowhere else in the N. T. The exact formula, "is it not written in your law (that)," occurs nowhere else in the N. T.; but cf., e.g., 1 Cor 14: 21. The quotation agrees exactly with the LXX of Ps 82: 6. The whole context, with the quotation put into Jesus' mouth, is to be understood as a literary device on the part of Jn to strengthen and present in a different way his theological view of the uniqueness of Jesus, especially Jesus' unique relationship with the Father. There is no evidence that Jn used a testimony text.

Jn 12: 13. This quotation is on the lips of the great multitude who had come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem. The line, "blessed is the one coming in the name of the Lord," is cited in exactly the same way in Mk 11: 10 = Mt 21: 9 and Mt 23: 39 = Lk 13: 35. In Lk 19: 38 the words "the king" are inserted between "coming" and "in." The word ὁσάννά, before the line in Jn, also occurs with the quotation in Mk 11: 9 and Mt 21: 9; but in Mk there is an addition, after the line in Jn, of "blessed is the coming kingdom of our father

David, hosanna in the highest"; and in Mt "hosanna" is followed with "to the son of David," and the line quoted in Jn is followed with an addition, "hosanna in the highest." This is the only formal quotation in Jn given without an introductory formula. The line from "blessed" to "Lord" is exactly the LXX form of Ps 118: 26, which is an exact translation of the Heb. The word ὡσαννά is a transliteration of the Heb. word "hosanna," not a translation of it as is the σῶσον δὴ of the LXX. Evidence has been presented to show that the Gr. word ὡσαννά, which does not occur in the LXX, is a Christian invention to give new meaning to an old Heb. expression. Therefore, the term should be translated into English with some such verb as "give praise" (or "praise") or "give glory" (or "glory"), indicative of a feeling of reverent joy and gladness. Jn's main concern in the context of the quotation is not, as in the Synoptics, with Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Rather, Jn has taken elements from the Synoptic account of that incident in Jesus' life and inserted them into the larger framework of the Lazarus story at an opportune time to bring his theme of Jesus as *King* to a high point in its development. This quotation comes closer to being an early Christian *testimonium* than any thus far. Or perhaps its frequent occurrence in the gospels was due to its use in an early Christian liturgy, as some suggest, though this is doubtful.

Jn 12: 15. The first quotation in the words of the gospel writer is part of the continuation of the same context as the previous one. It is a composite quotation; the second part, from Zech 9: 9, occurs also in Mt 21: 5, where it is given in a different form and conflated with a preceding line from Is 62: 11. The formula, as in 6: 31, is "just as it is written," and it occurs only in those two places in the N. T. The exact source of the first part of the quotation cannot be determined, but it is probably Zeph 3: 14 ff. and might be made from either the Heb. or Gr. text. The source usually given for the second part of the quotation is Zech 9: 9. However, evidence has been presented to show that the quotation in Jn is a free artistic composition on the basis of Mt and Mk to give strength to the author's theme of Jesus as king. A less acceptable alternative is the view of Barrett that "John quoted loosely from memory." Although the passage from Zech 9: 9 was regarded as a *testimonium* to the messiahship of Jesus, there is no evidence that there was a set form of text. This is apparent from the great diversity in which the form of the text is cited.

Jn 12: 38. The second quotation given in the words of the writer shows that the unbelief of the people had been predestined by God himself as

recorded in the prophecy of Isaiah. The first part—"Lord, who has believed our report?"—is cited also by Paul in Rom 10: 16 exactly as in Jn. The formula, "in order that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled which he spoke," occurs nowhere else in the same way. λόγος as part of a formula is used only here, in Jn 15: 25, and Lk 3: 4 (in pl.) in the N. T. The source is exactly the text of Is 53: 1 in its LXX form. For Jn the word "report" is indicative of the words of Jesus and the "arm" of his deeds, both of which were rejected by the Jews. Paul, on the other hand, in his context was interested only in "the word of Christ," so he used only the first part of the quotation. The evidence is against the use of a testimony text.

Jn 12: 39 f. This quotation, in the words of the writer, is part of the same context as the previous one. The unbelief of the people gives occasion for the use of both quotations. A sentence connecting the second with the first becomes a sort of introductory formula for the second. The passage from Is 6: 9 f. is cited also in Mt 13: 14 f. and Acts 28: 26 f. It is also alluded to or quoted loosely in Mk 4: 12; Mt 13: 13; and Lk 8: 10. The actual formula, "again Isaiah said," occurs nowhere else; but the one in Rom 15: 12, "and again Isaiah says," is close to it. Is 6: 9 f. is obviously the direct source, but there is no certainty about whether Jn used the Heb. or Gr. text. The text of Jn differs from the MT, LXX, and Synoptics. Jn's theological view is responsible for making God the subject in Is (or probably Jesus in the text of Jn), so a sing. verb in past tense and active voice is required. Jn differs from MT, LXX, and Mt-Acts in the omission of the reference to ears and hearing. This omission is intentional in view of the context. The part of the quotation from the beginning to and including ἵνα μὴ might be made from either Heb. or Gr. text. Of the last twelve words, ten are in exactly the same form as in the LXX. The theological view of Jn is responsible for his form of the quotation from Is 6: 9 f. The unbelief of the multitude is explained as predestined by God and fulfills what Jn believed had been prophesied concerning Jesus. The diversity of text-form of the quotation in the gospels, Acts, and early Christian writers gives no evidence that *testimonia* were used at all.

Jn 13: 18. Here we have one of two quotations of fulfillment on the lips of Jesus, and it is a part of his discourse to the disciples after the feet washing. This quotation occurs nowhere else in the N. T., but Ps 41: 10 is probably alluded to in Mk 14: 18. The formula, "(but) in order that the scripture might be fulfilled," occurs also in Jn 17: 12; 19: 24; and 19: 36, all without ἀλλά, but nowhere else in the N. T.

The source is clearly Ps 41: 10, and here Jn may be closer to the Heb. text for about half of the quotation than to the Gr.; but it is impossible to tell definitely. It is a free adaptation to fit the immediate context and gives emphasis to Jn's theme of Judas as the betrayer of Jesus. An underlying motive for the use of a quotation here was to supplement the Synoptic account of the traitor. The words of Mk 14: 21 and Mt 26: 24, "just as it is written," without a subsequent quotation, provided the necessary incentive for a quotation in Jn's account. Lk's change to *κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον* already seems to be an effort to reconcile the difficulty. The words *μετ' ἐμοῦ*, present in P⁶⁶, add weight to our theory of influence from Mk 14: 18. The facts that Ps 41 is nowhere else quoted in the N. T. with reference either to Judas or Jesus, and apparently was not even regarded as messianic, preclude Jn's use of *testimonia* for this quotation.

Jn 15: 25. The second quotation of fulfillment on the lips of Jesus. Hatred for the Father and for Jesus came about "in order that the word written in their law might be fulfilled." The words from Pss 35: 19 and 69: 5 quoted here are not quoted or alluded to anywhere else in the N. T. The precise formula—in quotation marks above—also occurs nowhere else in the N. T. It is impossible to tell from which text the quotation is made since the LXX translates the Heb. literally and Jn agrees with neither. Again the viewpoint of the writer has determined the form of the quotation. Jesus is said to apply the words of the psalmist(s) to the Jews in such a way as to show that his persecution and hatred by the Jews without cause had been prophesied in their own law. There is no evidence for Jn's use of a testimony text.

Jn 17: 12. ἡ γραφή here is probably not to be regarded as a reference to O. T. scripture but rather to the words of Jesus himself formerly spoken in 6: 70 f. and now having fulfillment. Of the alternate views proposed by commentators I prefer the one which regards "the scripture" as a reference to Ps 41: 10 quoted in Jn 13: 18. I have suggested that if Jn is dependent upon an O. T. source for the quotation in 17: 12, the most likely one is the LXX of Prov 24: 22a since only there in the LXX do the words *υἱός* and *ἀπώλεια* occur together. Jn takes a familiar Semitic expression, "the son of perdition," and uses it in a creative way to support his theme of Judas the betrayer. In that role Judas stands in sharp contrast to Jesus as the son of God.

Jn 19: 24. This quotation is in the words of the writer. Lots are cast for Jesus' tunic to see whose it shall be, "in order that the scripture might be fulfilled." Ps 22: 19 is quoted in the same way nowhere else in the N. T., but it may be alluded to, without formulas of introduction,

in Mk 15: 24 and parallels. In some texts of Mt 27: 35 the passage is quoted exactly as in Jn 19: 24 and introduced with Mt's characteristic formula. The formula—in quotation marks above—occurs also in Jn 17: 12 and 19: 36 but nowhere else in the N. T. This passage is an exact quotation of the LXX text of Ps 22: 19 where the Gr. is a literal translation of the MT except that it renders the verbs with the aorist instead of the present or future. Jn's incentive for the use of an O. T. quotation here, as in 19: 28, came from his understanding of Mk 15: 24 and 15: 23, 36 and parallels. Jn was the first to see in those Synoptic passages allusions to O. T. scripture. He makes his interpretation of the drink offered to Jesus and the parting of his garments clear by explaining both as the fulfillment of O. T. scripture. His effort to interpret and supplement the Synoptic account led to the discovery and use of the Ps text. A curious misunderstanding of the LXX text, which is a reproduction of the Hebrew synonymous parallelism, is analogous to Mt's misunderstanding of his text of Zech 9: 9. That misunderstanding led to his embellishment with respect to the *ἰμάτια* and *χιτὼν*. There is no evidence for the use of a testimony text.

Jn 19: 28 f. The quotation is put on the lips of Jesus as a saying from the cross and is found nowhere else in the N. T. The formula, "in order that the scripture might be accomplished," with *τελειόω* instead of *πληρόω*, makes this formula a unique one and is found nowhere else in the N. T. *τελειόω* is to be explained as synonymous for *πληρόω* or *τελέω* and as such is a literary variation with *τελέω* used immediately before and again in vs. 30. Or it may be meant to show some theological significance. The O. T. source for the word *διψῶ* and the text the writer had in mind thus far remain unknown. The weight of suggestion seems to be in favor of Ps 69: 22. But we suspect a purely literary-theological motive for the creation of a supposed quotation from scripture which may or may not be influenced by the recollection of some O. T. passage such as Ps 69: 22. This is one of the clearest examples of the writer's creative use of his Synoptic sources showing his own literary-theological changes and additions. The same thing is true for Jn 19: 29. Again there is no evidence for Jn's use of *testimonia*.

Jn 19: 36 f. The quotations, in the words of the writer, are a part of Jn's story of the crucifixion of Jesus. They are not found anywhere else in the N. T., but the words from Zech 12: 10 are alluded to in Rev 1: 7. The formula for the first is "in order that the scripture might be fulfilled." The second quotation is separated from the first only by its formula of introduction, "and again another scripture says," and occurs

nowhere else in the N. T. Jn 19: 36 is a free citation, perhaps from memory, of Ex 12: 10 (LXX), 46 or Num 9: 12 or Ps 34: 21 or a combination of the Ps text with one of the others. The verb in Jn agrees exactly with the Gr. of the Ps. But the evidence indicates that the text of Jn as a whole is closer to the LXX of Ex 12: 10 than to any other passage and must be considered as the most likely direct source. In this case Jn's verb would be a slight correction from the third sing. fut. mid. form to the third sing. fut. pass. form which makes better sense and satisfies his theological view completely. In view of the evidence it seems reasonable to suspect Jn's theological view of Jesus as the paschal lamb as the motive responsible for the use of the quotation. Therefore the text from Ex or Num would be the logical source. Evidence for a testimony text here does not exist.

With respect to Jn 19: 37 I agree that the source of the quotation was originally Zech 12: 10 and conclude that the reading of Jn, including the verb ὁράω, was of Christian origin, and that the reading was derived from some Heb. text and may well have originated with Jn himself. An alternative view is that Jn has taken over a version current in his time, perhaps even a testimony text. For the following reasons Zech 12: 10 has a better claim to being an early Christian *testimonium* than any other passage quoted in Jn: In general, the vocabulary used by early Christian writers in quoting Zech 12: 10 is the same as that of Jn; in early Christian writers¹⁾ Zech 12: 10 is used in an apocalyptic context dealing with the second advent (or the resurrection along with it); it is so used in the allusions of Rev 1: 7 and Mt 24: 30; and this usage corresponds to the original context of Zech itself. Such a *testimonium* would have been used in the transmission of the early Christian belief in the second coming of Jesus.

On the other hand, Zech 12: 10 is nowhere else expressly quoted in the N. T.²⁾ And while the vocabulary of early Christian writers is the same as that of Jn, the passage from Zech is rarely quoted in exactly the same form, frequently with more of the Zech text than Jn quotes. These things tend to refute the idea of a *testimonium* even here.³⁾

¹⁾ Cf., e.g., *Ep. of Barn.* 7: 9; Justin, *Apol.* 1, 52: 12; *Dial.* 14: 8; 32: 2; 64: 7; 118: 1; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4: 33: 11.

²⁾ This is true for the book of Zech as a whole with the exception of Zech 9: 9; 11: 12 f.; 13: 7 which are really not literally quoted, although introduced with formulas of quotation. There are frequent allusions to passages from Zech. These statements become clear by checking the list given in the back of Nestle's Greek Testament.

³⁾ Cf. esp. the arguments against a *testimonium* by Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 f.

It is impossible to classify Jn's quotations either on the basis of text used or by formulas of introduction. The form of each quotation is determined by its place in the immediate context of which it is a part and/or its place in the composition of the gospel as a whole. For this reason even the following classifications are not absolute.

Where Jn agrees exactly with an O. T. text it is always with the LXX, and we can be certain of this in only four places: 2: 17; 10: 34; 12: 38; 19: 24. In 2: 17, however, the LXX reading of Ps 69: 10 known to Jn is not certain. We might add 12: 13 to that list since there all but the first word is exactly the LXX text. Except for the first of those five places, the reading of Jn is the same as that of the big three of the LXX, BA^x. In 2: 17 Jn agrees with B^x against A. In no place does Jn agree exactly with the reading of the MT. The one exception is in Jn 19: 37 where some Heb. mss. of Zech 12: 10 have the same reading as in Jn. For all other quotations it is impossible to tell whether they were made definitely from the Heb. or Gr. text. In most places a stronger case can be made for the use of the Gr. than for the Heb. In addition to Jn 19: 37 a strong case can be made for the use of the Heb. text in Jn 13: 18. There is no difference with respect to text used between those quotations on the lips of Jesus and others. In 6: 31; 6: 45; and 7: 42 the text of Jn shows some affinities to the text of the Targums.

Seven quotations are given on the lips of Jesus: 6: 45; 7: 37 f.; 10: 34; 13: 18; 15: 25; 17: 12; 19: 28; six in the words of the writer: 12: 15; 12: 38; 12: 39 f.; 19: 24; 19: 36; 19: 37; three on the lips of the crowd: 6: 31; 7: 42; 12: 13; one in the words of the Baptist: 1: 23; and one is put in the minds of Jesus' disciples: 2: 17.

For the eighteen different quotations Jn uses thirteen or fourteen different formulas of introduction; once he does not use a formula. His favorite expressions in formulas are γεγραμμένον with ἐστίν and ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ. The former occurs in 2: 17; 6: 31; 6: 45; 10: 34; and 12: 14; the latter in 17: 12; 19: 24; 19: 36; and in 13: 18 with initial ἀλλά; others indicating fulfillment are 12: 38 and 19: 28. The terminology of his favorite expressions occurs nowhere outside of Jn in the N. T., but cf. Mk 14: 49; Mt 26: 56; and Lk 4: 21. Other N. T. writers generally prefer γέγραπται, but this form is nowhere used in Jn. The formula καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον occurs in 6: 31 and 12: 14. Not one of Jn's formulas occurs in exactly the same way anywhere else in the N. T. The different types of formulas are to be understood in the light of his variation of style throughout.

We have just noted that as a formula for introducing quotations N. T.

writers in general prefer the form *γέγραπται* and that Jn never uses that form. That was the regular form used in pagan inscriptions and papyri to seal an unalterable agreement, giving it juristic authority.¹⁾ Jn must have been familiar with that form, but why did he avoid using it? Did he want to avoid giving the impression that he was quoting from an unalterable document? It could be that *ἡ γραφή* and *ἔστιν γεγραμμένον* had the same significance for him as *γέγραπται* had for those who used it. Deissmann²⁾ quotes Cremer who says that the N. T. usage of *ἡ γραφή* "implies the same idea as is stamped upon the usage of the *γέγραπται*, viz., a reference to the regulative character of the particular document as a whole, which character gives it a unique position, in virtue of which *ἡ γραφή* is always spoken of as an authority."

That *ἡ γραφή* had a unique position of authority in the minds of N. T. writers and other early Christian writers is indisputable. It was quoted with unquestionable authority to support a particular theological point the author wanted to make. Nevertheless that authority did not carry with it a sanctity that rendered the document being quoted as unalterable. All N. T. and early Christian writers frequently altered passages quoted to support the theological view of the writer which was responsible for the use of the quotation in the first place. This is probably truer for Jn than for any other N. T. writer. One wonders whether by avoiding the use of *γέγραπται* Jn thought he had an even greater license for altering his quotations to suit his theological views.

The following passages in Jn have some sort of parallel in the Synoptics, either as quotations from the same O. T. passage or allusions to the same passage or are in some other way related to Synoptic passages: 1: 23; 7: 42; 12: 13; 12: 15; 12: 39 f.; 19: 24. In at least five other places (2: 17; 13: 18; 19: 28 f.; 19: 36; 19: 37) this study of the quotations in Jn has revealed interesting and important light on the problem of Jn's relationship to the Synoptics. Only three passages have parallels in other N. T. writings: 12: 38 (Rom 10: 16); 12: 39 f. (Acts 28: 26 f.); 19: 37 (Rev 1: 7). The other passages have no parallels with any other N. T. writings.

In at least three passages the thought and language of Jn show a kinship to that of the wisdom literature of the Heb. and/or Gr. O. T.: 1: 23; 7: 37 f.; and 17: 12.

Since the source of several quotations cannot be positively determined,

¹⁾ Cf. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (1923), pp. 112 f., 249 f.; Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (1957).

²⁾ Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

it cannot be stated accurately how many times a certain book is quoted. However, we can be sure of quotations from the Pss in six places: 2: 17; 10: 34; 12: 13; 13: 18; 15: 25; 19: 24 (cf. 6: 31); from Is in four: 1: 23; 6: 45; 12: 38; 12: 40. In his preference for the Pss and Is Jn is in accord with the other N. T. writers and the sect of Qumran. Other O. T. books specifically quoted are Ex and Zech (twice), and probably Zeph.

In several places quotations are combined and/or conflated: 6: 31; 7: 42; and 12: 15; cf. also 12: 38 f. and 19: 36. In several places the thought of Jn shows influence from other O. T. passages in addition to the one specifically quoted: 1: 23; 6: 31; 6: 45; 7: 37 f.; 7: 42; 19: 36. In the following places we cannot be absolutely certain of the source of the quotation, if an O. T. source is meant: 7: 37 f.; 7: 42; 12: 15; 17: 12; 19: 28 f.; 19: 36.

In only one place can a case be made for Jn's use of a testimony text (19: 37), but even there the evidence is by no means conclusive. There is slight reason to suspect Jn's use of a testimony text only in one other place (12: 13). There is really no conclusive evidence that Jn used testimonies at all. This is true in spite of the fact that among the Qumran Scrolls we now have what appears to be a genuine collection of *Testimonia*. Unless there is more evidence for such a book than that presented by Allegro and Fitzmyer in their works cited in this study, the evidence at present seems insufficient to indicate that the sect was consciously using O. T. passages as testimonies in the sense we think of them in the study of N. T. quotations. The Qumran *Testimonia* as Allegro presents them seem to me to be only a stringing together of O. T. passages without introductory formulas in the same manner as in the books of Rev and Heb, e.g., in the N. T. Cf. also Acts 7; 8: 34-38; Rom 3: 10-18; Heb 1: 5-13; 10: 5-15; and 1 Pet 2: 1-12. Long after the composition of this paragraph I find it gratifying to read the statement of Barnabas Lindars, which I am able to insert at this point: "The title *Testimonia* is a trifle too *nuancé*, as it is by no means clear that we have here the sort of document proposed by Rendel Harris."¹

This study has shown that the theories of Torrey, Burney, and others who claim that the quotations in Jn were made on the basis of underlying Heb. or Aram. texts are much overworked. In one place Torrey says that *all* quotations in Jn are made from the Heb. and from memory.²) The strong possibility still remains that the factor of memory may account for

¹) *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (1961), p. 280, n. 1.

²) *The Four Gospels*, p. 330.

many of the differences in Jn. We have shown that few of Jn's quotations as they now stand can be said to be made definitely from the Heb. text as we now have it. Torrey and others have paid too little attention to the contexts of which the quotations are a part and to the theological motives and stylistic methods of the writers. Hence those men begin with the false assumption that each quotation is meant to be given literally. In reality, however, the writer adapts each quotation to his context, to his literary style, and to the whole scheme of composition. The same thing is true for other N. T. writers than Jn, even for the Synoptists. But in no other writer are the O. T. quotations so carefully woven into the context and the whole plan of composition as in Jn.

This study has also refuted the view that ἡ γραφή in Jn always refers to a single O. T. passage. In at least two passages (7:37 f. and 7:42) more than one passage is included. And for 7:42 evidence has been presented to show that material from a N. T. writer might also be included under the term ἡ γραφή. Nor does Jn's use of the term lessen his dependence upon the Synoptics for the composition of a particular context.

In several places we have seen that the method of Jn is similar to that of the sect of Qumran when quoting passages from the O. T. Other likenesses between Jn and certain materials from Qumran have influenced some scholars to reaffirm the view that the date of Jn's gospel is as early as the Synoptics, if not earlier.¹) I believe this study lends additional evidence for the view that Jn is certainly later than the Synoptics regardless of the date of composition for either.

Finally, it may be said that when Jn was quoting a passage of O. T. scripture, he was bound by no rule or fixed text, testimony or other. In every instance his quoted text appears to be adapted to its immediate context, to his literary style, and to the whole plan of the composition of his gospel. Theological motives and ideas were his primary concern. Jn was only secondarily concerned with the actual quotation as such. The evidence from this study lends weight to the view that the gospel of Jn is primarily a theological and literary composition rather than a historical document. His method presupposes and reveals a thorough

¹) Cf. esp. W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (1955), p. 136; *ibid.*, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John" in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube (1956), pp. 153-171, esp. pp. 170 f.; and recently, J. A. T. Robinson, "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel" in *Twelve New Testament Studies* (1962), pp. 94-106; H. M. Teeple, "Methodology in Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 81 (1962), p. 282, n. 10.

training in the Jewish scriptures and tradition and a thorough knowledge of their content. The actual form of Jn's quotations may even be the result of study of written texts. This view is presented as a preferable alternative to that of memory. Of these texts the LXX was the most basic. But the evidence for the use of the Heb. text along with the Gr. is strong, as well as, in several clear cases, the tradition of the Targum.

The form of Jn's quotations also reveals an original treatment and creative use of his O. T. texts in a manner similar to his use of his Synoptic sources. Indeed, the evidence indicates that in the composition of his gospel Jn may have used his O. T. texts and his Synoptic sources simultaneously. This method of Jn makes the origin of his gospel in an early Christian school extremely likely. The gospel may have come from such a school where the position of the early church had to be maintained and defended. Perhaps this school felt the need, among other things, to strengthen and defend the Synoptic presentation of Jesus through the use of additional O. T. texts.¹⁾

¹⁾ Cf. Eusebius' statement that the three gospels had been written down before and distributed to all including John (*H. E.* 3: 24: 7; cf. also 3: 39: 1:4).